C.H. Turner

"Marcan Usage: Notes, critical and exegetical, on the second Gospel"

published in ten parts:
J Theol Studies 25 (1924) 377-386
J Theol Studies 26 (1924) 12-20
J Theol Studies 26 (1925) 145-156
J Theol Studies 26 (1925) 225-240
J Theol Studies 26 (1925) 337-346
J Theol Studies 27 (1925) 58-62
J Theol Studies 28 (1926) 9-30
J Theol Studies 28 (1927) 349-362
J Theol Studies 29 (1928) 275-289
J Theol Studies 29 (1928) 346-361

also added:
"A textual commentary on Mark 1"
J Theol Studies 28 (1927) 145-158

"Western readings in the second half of St Mark's Gospel"
J Theol Studies 29 (1927) 1-16

people to write or speak with genius and power, but they did teach a very clear insight into the meaning, nature, and function of language. Perhaps their work may best be seen in two products of these centuries, which have had at any rate a very remarkable permanence—the Roman Codes and the Creeds of the Christian Church.'

Writing now ten years later I might wish to add to or modify these words, but I should still maintain their substantial truth.

F. H. Colson.

P.S.—ἰδιωτισμός. Since writing the above I have noticed that Irenaeus (v 30) speaks of those who ἐσφάλησαν ἐπακολουθήσαντες ἰδιωτισμῷ by which 616 was substituted for 666 in the number of the Beast. The Latin translator keeps *sequentes idiotismum*, but as below where the Greek is not extant it is explained as *peccatum scriptorum* (ἁμάρτημα γραφέων?) by which ι was substituted for ξ, I infer that Irenaeus uses the word for 'error' much as Dionysius uses it.

The thought which this suggests is 'how imperfect is our lexicography of this sort of Greek'. These two examples of ἰδιωτισμός are ignored not only in Liddell and Scott, a work, so far as my experience goes, of little use for later Greek, but also in Stephanus. Yet both come from well-known passages in Greek Fathers and certainly vouch for a shade of meaning different from any there recorded.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL.

Dr Hort, in the great *Introduction* to his edition of the Greek Testament, lays down as fundamental the principle that 'Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings' (§ 38), using capitals in the text and italics in the table of contents to call special attention to the importance of the words. I want to enter a similar plea for what I conceive to be an even more important principle, namely that 'Knowledge of an author's usage should precede final judgement' alike as to readings, as to exegesis, and—in this case—as to the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels. The studies that follow are intended to be a contribution to the textual criticism and the exegesis of St Mark, and also to the better understanding of that department of the Synoptic problem which is concerned with the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. So long as it is supposed that there is a residuum of agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in matter taken from Mark—apart, that is, from passages found also in Q—which cannot be explained without assuming literary contact either of Matthew

and Luke with one another or of both with some other document than our extant Mark, so long will research into the Synoptic question be hampered and final solution delayed. We can only see things in their true proportions if we consider the evidence over a wide field, and note not only the agreements but the disagreements of the two later Synoptists in the handling of their common material. 'Use large maps' is a piece of advice that applies to other people besides politicians.

I propose therefore to treat in succession various characteristic Marcan usages, isolating each usage and examining it over the whole field of the Gospel. So and so only shall we be able to establish our inductions on a secure basis. And I cannot help thinking that the method proves itself to be unexpectedly fruitful in results.

I.

The Impersonal Plural.

By the impersonal plural is here meant the use of a plural verb with no subject expressed, and no subject implied other than the quite general one 'people'. This form of phrase, common in Aramaic as a substitute for the passive, is very characteristic of St Mark's narrative, and is generally altered in the other Synoptists either by the insertion of a definite subject or (and this especially in St Luke) by the substitution of the passive voice for the impersonal active. With the exception of two passages which present rather more difficulty than the rest and are therefore reserved for the end, the order of the Gospel is followed.

1. i 21, 22 καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν· καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων.

There is no subject to ἐξεπλήσσοντο, though we can of course supply 'the congregation'; but I think what Mark meant was simply 'people were astonished'. Luke eases the construction by transferring ἦν διδάσκων αὐτούς from the second part of the sentence to the first, so that αὐτούς explains ἐξεπλήσσοντο. Matthew characteristically inserts οἱ ὄχλοι, 'the multitudes were astonished'.

2. i 29, 30 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα· καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς.

St Mark means, I think, 'immediately He is told about her': he does not mean that 'Simon and Andrew with James and John' told Him, to the exclusion of the family in the house. Matthew, with his usual tendency to compress a story, omits the detail. Luke retains, only changing present to past tense and substituting a more definite word ἠρώτησαν, 'consulted Him', for Mark's recurring and colourless λέγουσιν.

3. i 32 *ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης . . . ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας.*

Matthew retains, with the past tense *προσήνεγκαν*. Luke inserts a nominative *πάντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις.*

4. i 45 *ἔξω ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν· καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.*

Matthew, omitting the whole verse, offers no parallel. Luke inserts *ὄχλοι πολλοί.*

5. ii 2, 3 *καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ . . . καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον. καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικόν.*

Obviously a new nominative must be supplied with *ἔρχονται*—'there arrive people bringing a paralytic . . .' So in terms Luke, *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες . . .*: Matthew is content with *καὶ ἰδοὺ προσέφερον*, but then, having omitted the previous verse of Mark, he has at least had no rival nominative in his preceding words.

6. ii 18 *καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;*

A singularly instructive example. It does not seem to me doubtful that St Mark means, neither that John's disciples came to put the question, nor that the Pharisees came, but simply that the question was put. Some of the people of the place noticed that there was a remarkable difference of religious observance at the moment between two sections of 'disciples' and a third: and they apply to the head of the section which was in a minority for an explanation of its difference from the others. But neither Matthew nor Luke likes to leave the matter so. They interpret Mark, and both of them interpret him to mean that it was one of the two opposing sections which put the question: Matthew places it in the mouth of the disciples of John, inserting *οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου*, Luke with *οἱ δὲ εἶπαν* treats the interlocutors as those of the preceding verses *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.*

7. iii 1, 2 *καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγήν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος . . . καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν . . .*

Mark's *εἰς συναγωγήν* is I think almost exactly 'He went to church'. There is therefore no nominative to *παρετήρουν*, and the equivalent English is 'watch was kept on Him to see if . . .' Matthew having written *εἰς συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν* has an implied nominative ready for his verb *ἐπηρώτησαν*, Luke inserts *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.*

8. iii 31, 32 *καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν· καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου . . .*

Clearly it is not the crowd who give the message. The porter or some one of that sort is charged to convey to Jesus the news that His mother wants to see Him: the inserted words *καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν*

ὄχλος logically belong to *v.* 34; but Peter visualizes the scene as he remembers it. Luke excellently represents the impersonal plural by the passive ἀπηγγέλη. Matthew's text, xii 47, offers a problem of some difficulty. It seems preposterous at first sight to suppose that words can be genuine which are absent from ℵ B L, the African Latin (*k*), the Old Syriac, and the Sahidic. But a sound instinct led Westcott and Hort to admit the words at least to their margin. For in the first place they are necessary to the sense: and in the second place experience of manuscripts establishes no rule on a more certain basis than that, where *homoioteleuton* will account for omission, the omitted words are probably genuine. It is therefore possible to say with some confidence that Mt. xii 47 is genuine, and that Matthew represented Mark's λέγουσιν by εἶπεν δέ τις. But even if they are not genuine, Matthew's τῷ λέγοντι in the next verse shews that he avoided the impersonal plural.

9. v 14 καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. καὶ ἦλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστιν τὸ γεγονός.

What St Mark of course means is that the inhabitants of the town and the villages came to see what had happened: Luke too thought that the words εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς sufficiently prepared for the change of subject, and retained Mark's language practically unaltered. Matthew on the other hand inserted πᾶσα ἡ πόλις as nominative.

10. v 35 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν.

'Messengers come from the ruler of the synagogue's house with the news that ...' Matthew's form of this story is an extreme instance of his tendency to compression: three successive verses in Mark, v 35–37, are entirely unrepresented, so we can only say 'no parallel'. Luke's ἔρχεταί τις ... λέγων reminds us of Matthew's εἶπέν τις in no. 8. Nothing is clearer throughout the series of these passages than the independence of Matthew and Luke in their treatment of the Marcan material. For the solitary coincidence between them see no. 12.

11. vi 14 καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ... ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ... ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ... ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἔλεγεν ...

An interesting instance, because of the doubt as to the reading in the case of the first ἔλεγον. Most authorities give ἔλεγεν, 'Herod said'. The authorities which give the plural are few but good: B D, now reinforced by W, and some Old Latins. And the plural is absolutely certain, for it is guaranteed by the parallel in Mark viii 28 (τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἠλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι Εἷς τῶν προφητῶν), and it is implied by the reproduction of the passage in Luke ix 7, διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι

ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη . . . Matthew omits all reference to the divergent contemporary views about Jesus, and therefore offers no real parallel. St Mark assuredly meant 'His reputation was now considerable, and different ideas were held about Him in different circles by His contemporaries: people were saying, Why, it's John the Baptizer *redivivus*, others No, it's Elijah, and others again A new prophet, just as there have been prophets from time to time before'.

12. vi 33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί· καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

Obviously[1] the many who recognized them were not the same necessarily as the people who ran on foot from all the cities. Rather the many who recognized the intention of Jesus and His disciples spread the news, and with many to circulate the report a large concourse of people from different directions could collect, all heading for the place of landing on the other side. I am not even sure that we should not put a comma after ὑπάγοντας, and translate 'And they were seen going, and many recognized them, and people ran on foot to the common meeting-point and anticipated their arrival'. All these details seemed to the later Evangelists superfluous, and they pruned them remorselessly. Both reduce Mark's four verbs to the single word—the only single word which would express the complete idea—ἠκολούθησαν: both supply οἱ ὄχλοι as again the only single noun which would cover those who saw, those who recognized, and those whose concourse was directed to the landing-place.

It should be noted that this is the solitary occasion on our list where Matthew and Luke make the *same* rectification of Mark's impersonal plural. But it has just been shewn what an obvious change it is: and Matthew inserts the same noun ὄχλοι on two other occasions in our list (1 and 15), Luke on one (4).

13. vi 42, 43 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα.

It was not the 5,000 who ate and were filled who picked up the fragments. Luke correctly interprets Mark when he substitutes ἤρθη for ἦραν. So still more expressly the Fourth Evangelist—who in the story of this miracle follows in Mark's footsteps—λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα (Jo. vi 12). Matthew alone retains Mark's phrase unaltered.

14. vi 53, 54 καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ . . . καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον . . .

We have now arrived at the long lacuna in Luke's copying of Mark:

[1] I think it quite obvious: but I have to admit that Swete *in loc.* appears to take πολλοί as subject to all the three verbs.

for our three instances 14, 15, and 16 there are no parallels in the third Synoptist.

Mark meant that the people of the district where Jesus landed recognized Him: Matthew states that expressly, *ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου.*

15. vii 31, 32 *καὶ πάλιν . . . ἦλθεν . . . εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας . . . καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον.*

Matthew generalizes from Mark's single instance, inserting *ὄχλοι πολλοί* as the subject, *καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν χωλοὺς τυφλοὺς κωφοὺς κυλλούς.*

16. viii 22 *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν· καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν.*

Those who came to Bethsaida were our Lord and His disciples. Those who brought the blind man to Him were people of the place: our English equivalent would probably be 'and a blind man was brought to Him'. The whole passage is absent from Matthew (though it presumably contributed the *τυφλούς* to Matthew's generalization in xv 30, see just above under 15) as well as from Luke.

17. x 1, 2 *καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι.*

The passage is included here with a little hesitation: but I believe both that this is the true reading, and that *ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν* is the impersonal plural—not 'the multitudes asked Him' but 'the question was asked of Him'. It would not be reasonable to suppose that the question of divorce was the dominant one in the minds of the crowds: Peter simply remembered the question being raised at that time. There is no parallel in Luke: Matthew supplies *προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι*, from which many authorities have borrowed *προσελθόντες οἱ Φ.* for the text of Mark.

18. x 13 *καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται.*

Luke retains the impersonal plural: Matthew substitutes the passive, *τότε προσενέχθησαν αὐτῷ παιδία.*

19. x 49 *καὶ εἶπεν Φωνήσατε αὐτόν. καὶ ἐφώνησαν τὸν τυφλόν.*

This passage is again included doubtfully, since it is possible to understand St Mark as meaning that our Lord addressed the command 'Call him' to definite persons who obeyed the command. I should rather understand the Evangelist to mean that our Lord ordered generally that Bartimaeus should be called, and that the order was carried out by somebody or other. In any case the detail was omitted by Matthew and only indicated by Luke.

20. xiii 9–11 *βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς· παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε . . . καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε.*

Both Matthew and Luke retain the impersonal plural here—it is the

solitary instance in our series in which both do so, but then it is also the solitary instance in our series in which the idiom is employed in the record of our Lord's words[1]—but in an earlier place in Matthew (x 17, where the substance of the Marcan passage is much more closely reproduced than it is at xxiv 9) we have, instead of βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and in that way a subject is supplied.

21. xiv 12 καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον.

Matthew, either because he thought the information superfluous or perhaps because he thought it absolutely misleading, omitted the clause ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον. Luke transposed the impersonal active, as in **8, 11, 13,** into a passive, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.

Of these twenty-one passages there are three for which there is no Matthaean parallel, **4, 10, 16,** and four for which there is no Lucan parallel, **14, 15, 16, 17.** Again, the actual phrase in which the impersonal plural occurs is dropped on four occasions by Matthew, **2, 11, 19, 21,** and on one by Luke, **19.** There remain fourteen passages in Matthew, sixteen in Luke, to consider.

The most common expedient in both Matthew and Luke is the insertion of a nominative as subject for the verb, which thus ceases to be impersonal. The expedient is adopted eight times by Matthew, **1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17,** seven times by Luke, **3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12.** Each of them uses τις once, Matthew **8**, Luke **10** : for the rest they used plural nouns or nouns of multitude. Only once do they agree on the nominative inserted, **12,** where οἱ ὄχλοι is common to both. Since the particular word ὄχλος was one of the most obvious nouns, if not the most obvious, to insert, the single coincidence is nothing unnatural.

Besides this, there was the possibility of using what we should feel in English the most idiomatic method of rendering St Mark's usage, and substituting a passive. Matthew does this once, **18,** Luke four times, **8, 11, 13, 21.**

These two expedients reduce the series to five passages apiece in Matthew and Luke, where the impersonal plural is retained. The evidence shews conclusively that the idiom is a regular and common one in Mark's narrative, and that on two occasions on an average out of three it is in some way got rid of by the other Synoptists.

With these results before us, let us now consider the two reserved passages, Mark iii 21 (**22**), xiv 1 (**23**).

22. iii 21 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι Ἐξέστη.

[1] Matthew and Luke shew a fair number of instances of the idiom in the record of Christ's teaching. What is remarkable is Mark's fondness for it, and their dislike of it, in narrative. No doubt they allowed themselves far larger latitude in recasting Mark's own story than in recasting the record of the Λόγοι of Christ.

The impression ordinarily and naturally caused by these words is that our Lord's family left home to get hold of Him, because they thought He was out of His senses. But in the light of what we now know of Mark's fondness for the impersonal plural, an alternative rendering becomes at once possible, 'for it was reported that He was out of His senses'. And the possible rendering becomes I think probable, or more than probable, if we consider the weakness of the reason given, on the ordinary view, for the action of Christ's family. They said He was mad: on what grounds? On the rather inadequate ground that the crowd was so great that nobody had room to eat. But on the view now proposed, St Mark has rounded off his story of the Call of the Twelve by the summary statement that the call was followed by a resumption of the work at Capernaum. Then begins a new paragraph, verses 21–35, dealing with two alternative explanations offered by those who criticized the new teacher's work: ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἐξέστη, ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει. The former was a local criticism, which reached the ears of His family at Nazareth, and they left home to see what restraining influence they could exert over Him: the latter was the suggestion of emissaries from Jerusalem. This is dealt with first: it is the sin against the Holy Ghost, the refusal to recognize that good deeds must come from the good God. The story then returns to the former. It is over-subtle to regard the intercalation of verses 22–30 as intended to allow time for the journey from Nazareth to Capernaum. It is rather that the mention of the earlier and more naïve criticism of people at Capernaum suggests at once to the writer the other more evil-minded but more logical theory of people from Jerusalem, and being reminded of it he deals with it first.[1]

23. xiv 1 ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν· ἔλεγον γὰρ Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μή ποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ.

'Next day was the Passover: and the chief-priests were on the look out for some underhand way of arresting Him: for it had been urged that an (open) arrest at the feast might lead to a riot.' That is I think what St Mark means. The emphasis in the second clause is, as the position of the word indicates, on δόλῳ: and what reason would there be for any emphasis on δόλῳ, if the point were that they were going to make *no* arrest during the festival? But if the conditions were (1) that the chief-priests were determined to arrest Jesus before He left Jerusalem, (2) that some of the Sanhedrists, to whom they felt bound to defer in

[1] I think myself that by the ἔλεγον of verse 30, ὅτι ἔλεγον Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, St Mark means again the impersonal plural 'because it was said', though it is of course possible that he is harking back to 'the scribes' of verse 22.

The view here taken of ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἐξέστη was originally suggested to me, at the close of a discussion about impersonal plurals in St Mark, by the Rev. R. H. Lightfoot of New College. It is, I understand, accepted by Sir John Hawkins.

order to secure unanimity, made a timid *caveat* against any action which might involve the chance of a riot at the moment of arrest, then the need for δόλος explains itself. An arrest effected by δόλος would avoid the chance of a riot, whether it was effected during the festival or no. Hence the value to them of Judas, and of the information which enabled them to carry out their *coup* in the late evening and at a retired spot.

It has been suggested that the mysterious directions given by our Lord to disciples in xi 2 and xiv 13, where no names are named, were intended to prevent Judas from obtaining previous knowledge of our Lord's movements which he could convey to the Jewish authorities. However that may be, it seems clear that δόλος meant just the securing of a time and place for the arrest where popular support for Jesus would have no opportunity of asserting itself. It is difficult to suppose that it is intended to imply a contrast between an arrest on Thursday and an arrest on Friday. And the solitary change which Matthew makes in copying Mark is in this respect very instructive: for, understanding ἔλεγον to refer back to the chief priests, he alters ἔλεγον γάρ into ἔλεγον δέ. The chief priests, that is to say, determined to arrest Jesus, but determined at the same time that an arrest during the feast must be avoided. Later exegesis has, as in so many other passages, interpreted Mark by Matthew. But if Mark's account is taken as the primary one, ἔλεγον γάρ gives the reason for δόλος. On the ordinary view, St Mark ought to have written 'Next day being passover, the authorities determined to effect the arrest of Jesus before passover began: for they said, Not during the feast . . .' But that is not what St Mark says. He says, 'The feast being now imminent, the authorities determined to avoid a direct and open arrest, for the objection had been taken that such methods were too dangerous at such a time: they had to have recourse therefore to some secret *coup*'.

I add, by way of appendix, yet one more passage, where, if we may assume the use of the impersonal plural, the reading which is perhaps the more probable would receive its explanation and justification:

24. xv 10 (8–11) *καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν. οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.*

The above reading, *παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν* without *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς* to follow, is that of B 1 *k* and the Sinai Syriac, and is supported by Matt. xxvii 18 *ᾔδει γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν*: and since it was certainly not the multitude who had handed Jesus over to the governor, we must take *παραδεδώκεισαν* as impersonal plural, and translate 'it was

for envy's sake that Jesus had been brought before him'. The alternative reading supplies a nominative to παραδεδώκεισαν: but it would be awkward even for Mark to end one sentence with οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς and begin the next sentence with οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς, and I incline to think that the first οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς is just an early scribal insertion, or more probably gloss, intended to make the sense of παραδεδώκεισαν clear to the reader.

I should like it to be understood that, while the idea and for the most part the material of this and the following papers are my own, the final form owes much to the help and criticism of the members of my Seminar.

(*To be continued.*)

C. H. TURNER.

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.

HAVING read with great interest Dr Caldecott's article on Dr Robert Eisler's views about the Cleansing of the Temple (*J. T. S.* xxiv, p. 382), together with Mr Cheetham's paper on 'Destroy this temple' (*J. T. S.* xxiv, p. 315), I feel impelled to make some remarks of my own.

I.

First of all, Dr Caldecott did very well in calling attention to Eisler's view. Dr Eisler is an astonishingly learned man, as his *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt* proves, not to speak of his many other works. And further, the Cleansing of the Temple is an incident of extraordinary interest to Christians—or it should be. As a rule it is taken as a matter of course, a thing that needs no explanation. I feel that too often this is the case only because no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming.

The particular interest and importance to us of the Cleansing of the Temple, so it seems to me, is that it is almost the only spontaneous action of our Lord. If He healed the lepers it was because He had met them, if He fed the multitudes it was because they had followed Him. He was crucified, because the authorities arrested and condemned Him. But He went out of His way, so to speak, to 'cleanse' the Temple —He need not have done it if He had not thought proper. Therefore it ought to be for us a very significant index of His mind and purpose: we Christians ought to have very clear ideas about it.

Let us first take Dr Eisler's point about the 'den of robbers'. Dr Eisler is certainly right in saying that the words of Jesus are a quotation or allusion to the Old Testament. It is certain that 'a House of Prayer for all the nations' is a reference to Isa. lvi 7, and that 'den of robbers' is a reference to Jer. vii 11, and that the meaning of these phrases in our Lord's mouth is what they mean in the original, not what they happen to sound like in the Greek of the Gospels or the English

Judaism. The Apocalypse, by its omission of all reference to the Incarnation, and by its use of the Jewish Wisdom-Logos theme, may have been regarded by the orthodox as lending support to this heresy. It is not to be wondered at, that this part of the Church questioned and rejected for so long this Book.

But time passed, and with it the peculiarly Jewish elements which remained in the doctrines of the Christian Church. We have learnt to read the Apocalypse anew in the light of the rest of the New Testament teaching. The Jewish elements in it have been sublimated as to their original meaning; but they remain to indicate the essential unity in the revelation that God, who spake in times past by the prophets through His Spirit concerning His Son, gave at last in that Son, His Word Incarnate. The seer read that revelation aright when he declared, 'The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy'.

G. H. DIX.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*)

II.

Φέρειν in St Mark

Φέρειν is one of the words specially characteristic of the Second Gospel, and Sir John Hawkins rightly includes it in his list *Horae Synopticae*[2] p. 13. If we make abstraction of the technical usage of φέρειν 'to bear fruit', the figures for the four Gospels are Mark 14, Matthew 4, Luke 4, John 8. Sir John Hawkins leaves the matter there: but examination of the passages concerned reveals the secret of the disproportionate occurrence of the word in Mark. The other three Evangelists, in fact, limit the meaning of φέρειν, speaking generally, to the sense of 'carry': Mark, on the other hand, uses it also, and more frequently, in the sense of 'bring'. The difference is therefore a lexical one. It is well illustrated in the treatment of Mark **2** (ii 3) by Luke, and of Mark **7** (xi 2, 7) by both Matthew and Luke.

1. Mark i 32 *ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας*. Here *ἔφερον*, as in the parallel cases **2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9**, means certainly 'brought', not 'carried': and therefore Matthew substitutes *προσήνεγκαν* and Luke *ἤγαγον*.

2. ii 3 *καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων*. So far is Mark from implying the sense of 'carry' in *φέροντες* that he finds it necessary to add *αἰρόμενον* to convey the further

idea: 'they bring to him a paralytic, carried by four men'. Matthew again substitutes προσφέρειν: Luke transfers φέροντες to take the place of αἰρόμενον 'men (come) carrying on a bed a man who was paralysed'.

3 *a.* vi 27 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτορα ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

b. vi 28 καὶ ἤνεγκεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι.

Here the natural rendering in verse 27 would be 'bring', but in verse 28 we could no doubt say either 'he brought his head on a dish' or 'he bore his head on a dish'. The episode is absent from Luke: Matthew's abbreviated narrative dispenses with the ἐνέγκαι of verse 27, but retains the ἤνεγκεν of verse 28 in the passive form ἠνέχθη 'his head was borne on a dish'.

4. vii 32 καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον. Obviously they 'bring' the man, not 'carry' him. So Matthew (Luke again has no parallel) paraphrases with προσῆλθον . . . ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, once more refusing Mark's usage of φέρειν.

5. viii 22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαιδάν. καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν. Neither Matthew nor Luke retains the episode: if they had retained it, we may presume that they would have done as they regularly do elsewhere and have avoided the word φέρειν.

6 *a.* ix 17 διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρὸς σέ.

b. 19 φέρετε αὐτὸν πρός με.

c. 20 καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν.

Luke reduces the triple use of the word to a single occasion, and there substitutes προσάγαγε. Matthew inserts προσήνεγκα at one point, drops the ἤνεγκα, ἤνεγκαν, of verses 17 and 20, but retains the φέρετε of verse 19. Here (Matt. xvii 17) we have the solitary instance in which Mark's φέρειν = 'bring' retains its place in either of the other Synoptists. Probably the use was felt to be more tolerable in the imperative[1]: possibly it is eased by Matthew's addition of ὧδε. So Matt. xiv 18 of the loaves and fishes φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτούς.

7 *a.* xi 2 εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον . . . λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε.

b. 7 καὶ φέρουσιν τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Both Matthew and Luke substitute ἀγάγετε in *a*, ἤγαγον in *b*. Luke therewith makes his regular alteration: Matthew for once deserts προσφέρω for ἄγω, presumably because 'leading' is a natural word to employ of an animal.

8 *a.* xii 15 φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα ἴδω.

b. 16 οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν.

Matthew ἐπιδείξατέ μοι . . . οἱ δὲ προσήνεγκαν. Luke δείξατε, omitting the addition that a δηνάριον was then brought. Neither would talk of

[1] See for the imperative also Luke xv 23 (quoted in the next note), and Jo. xx 27 φέρε τὸν δάκτυλον.

φέρειν in connexion with a coin: but Luke's normal substitution of ἄγειν was inappropriate here, and he had to find another word. That he and Matthew should have found the same substitute for φέρετε in δείξατε (ἐπιδείξατε) naturally challenges our attention. But coincidences will happen: they have no significance unless they bear an undue proportion to the total number of cases in which they could happen. And if the chances were—as presumably they were—that one or other of the group of Pharisees and Herodians had a *denarius* on his person, then 'shew me one' was an even more natural phrase than 'bring me one'.

9. xv 22 (ἀγγαρεύουσιν . . . Σίμωνα . . . ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ) καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθὰν τόπον . . . (καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν).

Mark uses αἴρω, as in ii 3, for 'carrying' the cross: Luke, as there, substitutes φέρειν. Mark's φέρειν for 'bring' him to Golgotha is of course rejected by both Matthew and Luke, who agree in simplifying the sentence into the form 'on their arrival (ἐλθόντες, ὅτε ἀπῆλθον) at Golgotha . . . they crucified him'. Again a coincidence, but surely a very obvious one, once it is postulated that the word φέρειν had somehow to be got rid of, and that the four verbs connected by καί in Mark xv 22–24 offered an irresistible temptation to revision.

In the result, out of fourteen instances of φέρειν in Mark, the word is never retained by Luke,[1] once only by Matthew; though Luke twice (v 18, xxiii 26) transfers it to the immediate context, displacing Mark's αἴρειν to make room for it. For φέρειν Luke's favourite alternative is ἄγειν (three times) or προσάγειν (once). Mark only once has ἄγειν in the ordinary transitive use: Matthew, save in the episode of the 'bringing' of the colt to Jesus, shares Mark's avoidance of ἄγειν, and replaces φέρειν by προσφέρειν (four times), a word which he employs nearly twice as often as the other three Evangelists put together.

III.

εἰς and ἐν in St Mark

[On εἰς (εἰς and ἐν) in the New Testament see Winer-Moulton *Grammar of New Testament Greek*[9] pp. 514, 516–518, who give the older view that there is no, or next to no, real confusion between the two prepositions: on the other side J. H. Moulton *Prolegomena to a Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1906) pp. 62–63, and especially 234; Fr. Blass *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (1896) § 39. 3 (4, 5) pp. 119–121; L. Radermacher *Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*

[1] Yet compare Luke xv 23 φέρετε τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν (again however in the imperative, as Matt. xiv 18, xvii 17, see above under 6 *b*), Acts v 16 φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς.

(1911) pp. 16, 10: and for εἰς in modern Greek A. Thumb *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* (1895) § 202, p. 120.]

The following list of passages is intended to justify the conclusion that in Mark's usage εἰς is frequently used in the place of ἐν, ἐν perhaps occasionally where we should rather expect εἰς (see **2, 10**): that the other two Synoptists, and Matthew more consistently than Luke, dislike the confusion of the two prepositions and generally alter Mark's phraseology: and that the volume of evidence for εἰς = ἐν as a favourite usage of Mark is sufficient to turn the scale where the witnesses happen to be divided, some giving an εἰς = ἐν reading and others either having ἐν in place of εἰς (**6, 15**) or more often introducing into the text a verb of motion (**3, 4, 14**).

1. i 9 ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. It is quite impossible, in my judgement, to suppose that by this phrase Mark means anything at all different from i 5 ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ: the phrases were to him synonymous. Matthew retains ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ of the multitudes, and for the baptism of Jesus alters the construction to παραγίνεται ... ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ... τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι. Luke omits both ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ and εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην.

[**2.** i 16 ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. Matthew more correctly βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν: Luke has no parallel. Most MSS of Mark insert a noun (some ἀμφίβληστρον from Matthew, others, possibly rightly, τὰ δίκτυα) to give ἀμφιβάλλοντας an object: but the insertion only makes the use of ἐν odder still.]

3. i 21 ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν. So ℵ C L Δ 28 33 Ferrar group syr^{sin} Origen: εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν A B D W Θ latt. The latter group is in itself the stronger, and I cannot regard ℵ Origen as more than a single witness. But Westcott-Hort give the shorter reading a place in their margin, and the close parallels of **4** and **14** suggest that the scholar who produced the B text, whenever he found εἰς without any idea of motion expressed, systematically put matters right from a grammatical point of view by the insertion of the verb ἔρχομαι (εἰσέρχομαι). Still in view of the Latin evidence, and of the Greek support for the same reading, the decision is perhaps less easy than in any other instance of reading on our list. Neither of the other Synoptists has a parallel text here.

4, 5. i 39 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. So A C D W Δ latt syr^{sin}: ἦλθεν ℵ B L Θ. With regard to the prepositions, Matthew changes εἰς both times into ἐν, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν: Luke retains εἰς on the first occasion, but by combining the two phrases into εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Γαλιλαίας [Ἰουδαίας] avoids the second. With regard to the verb, Matthew changes to περιῆγεν 'went about', Luke has ἦν. It is much

more likely that Luke repeated ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς from Mark than that he altered ἦλθεν εἰς into ἦν εἰς. It is further much more likely that scribes or editors of Mark should have substituted ἦλθεν εἰς for ἦν εἰς than *vice versa*. I cannot doubt that ℵ B represent here an intentional correction of a non-literary usage of St Mark.

6. ii 1 ἠκούσθη ὅτι εἰς οἶκόν ἐστιν. So A C Δ and the margin of Westcott-Hort: ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν ℵ B D W Θ 33. Versions hardly count; but authority, it is clear, is preponderant for ἐν οἴκῳ: it is only the consideration that the temptation to alter εἰς οἶκον to ἐν οἴκῳ was infinitely greater than the converse which makes it likely that the inferior witnesses are right. There is no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.

7 *a*. iv 7 ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας.

b. 18 οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι.

Both Matthew and Luke alter Mark on the first occasion, the former to ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας, the latter to ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν: both, on the other hand, retain Mark's εἰς on the second occasion. There is indeed some authority for ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας both times in Mark, C D 33 in verse 7, ℵ C Δ in verse 18: the former is doubtless borrowed from the parallel in Matthew. And the parallel in Jeremiah iv 3 must not be overlooked, νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα, καὶ μὴ σπείρητε ἐπ᾽ ἀκάνθαις.

8. iv 8 ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν.

cf. verse 20 οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες.

Here Matthew changes εἰς to ἐπί in verse 8,[1] thus giving ἐπί in both places. Luke, more tolerant than Matthew of the Marcan use of εἰς, retains it[2] in Mark's verse 8, while he changes ἐπὶ τήν to ἐν τῇ in Mark's verse 20.

9. iv 8 εις τριάκοντα καὶ εις ἑξήκοντα καὶ εις ἑκατόν (with variant εν).

cf. verse 20 εν τριάκοντα καὶ εν ἑξήκοντα καὶ εν ἑκατόν.

By a curious freak of the Greek language εις εν can mean, according as breathing and accent differ, either the two correlated prepositions εἰς ἐν, or the masculine and neuter of the cardinal number one, εἷς ἕν. And since breathings and accents were not part of the usage of MSS at the time when our Gospels were written, we are thrown back on internal evidence to decide between possible interpretations. Matthew on each occasion substitutes ὃ μὲν . . . ὃ δὲ . . . ὃ δέ: he would therefore seem to

[1] εἰς tends to take the place of ἐπί (πρός) as well as of ἐν in Mark. i 10 καταβαίνων εἰς αὐτόν is changed by both Matthew and Luke to ἐπί: xiii 3 καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, Matthew writes ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους (see no. 19 below): and the very odd καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ of iv 1, where Matthew omits ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (Luke again gives no parallel), would at least be less odd if Mark had written ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης. But εἰς τὸ πέραν (iv 35, v 1, 21, vi 45, viii 13) and εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (vi 41, vii 34) are freely reproduced by Matthew and Luke, and have precedent in classical usage.

[2] If D here, Luke viii 8, has ἐπί, *a c d* 'super', the variant is probably due to a simple assimilation to Matthew.

have read ἕν, and certainly to have understood Mark to mean 'one . . . another . . . another'. Luke, with the dislike of an educated Greek for the Jewish use of symbolic numbers, omits the details on both occasions.

εἷς in verse 8 would be ungrammatical after ἄλλα, and if we translate with Matthew 'one . . . another . . . another' we must read the neuter ἕν throughout, against the testimony of ℵ B C* L Δ. The Latins followed Matthew's interpretation, and rendered *unum*: and so among moderns Blass *op. cit.* § 46. 2 p. 142. But in view of the Semitic idiom, which uses the preposition 'in' to mean 'at the rate of', I suspect that Mark had in his mind here the preposition and not the numeral. Further, if the mass of evidence adduced in these notes convinces us that the evangelist used the two prepositions ἐν and εἰς almost interchangeably, it becomes simple enough to suppose that he had the same idiom in his mind whether he expressed it by ἐν, as certainly in verse 20, or by εἰς, as perhaps in verse 8. Nay, it becomes even possible that cod. B is right in interchanging the two in a single verse: in verse 8 if B's εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν is the true text, we can the better understand why ℵ should have εἰς . . . εἰς . . . εἰς and A D ἐν . . . ἐν . . . ἐν.

[10. iv 36 παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. As in [2] above, this is an instance not of εἰς where we expect ἐν, but of ἐν where we expect εἰς. Luke omits the detail: Matthew restores the more correct use, ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον.[1]]

11. v 14 ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. An instance on the border-line, where εἰς might just be rendered 'announced it to the city', though it is hardly doubtful that the real meaning is 'in the city and in the country'. So, while Luke retains the Marcan phrase unaltered, Matthew, with his more rigid canon of exactness in respect of this preposition, inserts ἀπελθόντες before εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν.

12. v 34 ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην. Once more Matthew omits the phrase, and Luke, with the change of ὕπαγε into πορεύου, retains it. While μετ' εἰρήνης and ἐν εἰρήνῃ are common in the LXX, εἰς εἰρήνην is the characteristic use, following the Semitic idiom, with πορεύου and βάδιζε. Mark's phrase is therefore not destitute of precedent, though it is more likely that Luke consciously sheltered himself under this than that Mark did.

13. vi 8 ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν . . . μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν. Here the usual conditions are reversed, and it is Luke who omits, Matthew who retains, εἰς τὴν ζώνην. It is of course just possible

[1] It was suggested at our Seminar that ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ might be taken not with παραλαμβάνουσιν but with ὡς ἦν, 'just as he was, i. e. in the boat'. But Matthew obviously took the phrase with παραλαμβάνουσιν.

to say 'take no money for your purse', though the more natural phrase is undoubtedly 'in your purse'.

14. viii 26 μηδε[νὶ] εἰς τὴν κώμην εἴπῃς. There are no parallels from the other Synoptists: but the instance is a most significant one, and the case for the reading adopted above is in my judgement unanswerable. Westcott and Hort *Introduction* § 140 cite this verse with good cause as a typical 'conflate' reading of the received text: it is demonstrable that behind the form μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ lie two earlier readings, (1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς, and (2) μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ, which the Antiochene text has combined. Westcott-Hort treat the two briefer readings as rivals, and decide for the former, which is given by ℵ B L W 1 syr^{sin}. But what if we repeat the process of analysis, and ask whether both (1) and (2) cannot be explained as developements of a reading that lay further back than either of them? If we bear in mind (α) the accumulation of evidence in favour of the Marcan use of εἰς for ἐν: (β) the tendency of codex B to get rid of this unclassical idiom, on the more startling occasions of its employment, by the introduction of ἔρχομαι or εἰσέρχομαι—see 3, 4 above: (γ) the actual presence of the phrase μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην as part of the reading in D, and of 'ne cui diceret in castellum' as the whole reading in the Old Latin MS *c*: (δ) the ease with which the other early readings can be explained if we postulate μηδε[νὶ] εἰς τὴν κώμην εἴπῃς as the original source of the different developements: then I do not think it too much to say that the problem has solved itself.[1]

15. x 10 καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. Luke is no longer parallel to Mark: Matthew drops the whole phrase. But the reading is that of ℵ B D L Δ Ψ, and it must not be assumed that because the Latins give the ablative they found ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in their Greek exemplars. It cannot be too often repeated that a large element in our critical apparatus is vitiated because it is forgotten that the earliest translators translated by the sense and not by the letter, and followed the idiom of their own language. It is only the late pedantry of the Greek O. T. of Aquila, or the Harclean Syriac, or the English Revised Version of N.T., which so translates as to enable one to reconstruct the exact phraseology and order of their original.[2] So we are free to follow the reading of our best Greek MSS without reference on this occasion to the versions. The temptation to scribes to substitute ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in so palpable a case of εἰς = ἐν was obvious: it is rather

[1] When I first published my Inaugural Lecture, *The Study of the New Testament: 1883 and 1920* (1920), I had not grasped the evidence for St Mark's usage of εἰς = ἐν, and thought that the original text must have run μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην, without any verb: but my friend the Rev. H. N. Bate had already divined the true reading, as I have there recorded (p. 59 *ad fin.*).

[2] The Vulgate was saved from this pitfall of revision because Jerome was not only a good Greek scholar, but a great Latin stylist.

matter for wonder that the few MSS escaped it than that the many fell victims to it.

16. xi 8 πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. The verb 'to strew' might be conceived of as implying motion, 'strewed their garments on to the road': and if Mark never used εἰς for ἐν, some such explanation would be feasible. But in view of the evidence here accumulated, it is by far the simpler view that he meant 'on the road'. So certainly Matthew and Luke understood it, since both substitute ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. This is the first occasion on which we find them agreeing on ἐν for εἰς; but see also below, no. **20**.

[**17.** xiii 3 καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, 'as he was sitting on the Mount of Olives'. In English we can only render by 'on'. But that does not mean that the proper Greek word was necessarily ἐν: Matthew's ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους (Luke omits the whole detail) is doubtless more idiomatic. It remains, however, that it is a real example of the encroachments in vulgar use of εἰς upon other prepositions.]

18. xiii 9 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε. How is the sentence to be punctuated? Luke, omitting δαρήσεσθε entirely, is able to construct a simple sentence with two pairs of parallel nouns, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς, ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας. Matthew (x 17) sacrificed the connexion of συνέδρια and συναγωγάς, constructing the former with the verb that precedes it and the latter with the verb that follows it, παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε. I cannot doubt that Matthew is so far right that εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε was intended by Mark to be taken together, and that therefore εἰς συναγωγάς means nothing more nor less than 'in synagogues'. But I am also inclined to believe that Luke interprets correctly when he joins συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς—i. e. συνέδρια and συναγωγάς—in one construction: for it seems as odd to think that Mark meant to contrast the usage to be experienced in sanhedrins and in synagogues respectively,[1] as that he should have contrasted governors and kings. If I am right, Mark's thought implies a comma after ὑμᾶς, and another after δαρήσεσθε: 'they shall give you in charge, in sanhedrins and synagogues shall you be beaten, and before governors and kings shall you be made to stand'. The absolute use of παραδιδόναι is found in i 14 μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην, and in frequent references to Judas and the Betrayal of Christ.

[1] The suggestion was made in our Seminar that συνέδρια are the courts which pronounce the sentence, and συναγωγαί the scene of its execution. That appears to me a rather artificial contrast: but in any case if εἰς is to be taken in two different senses, 'to' and 'in', in the same line, the process of the suppression of ἐν in favour of εἰς must have gone already a long way.

Anyhow a clear case is established of εἰς = ἐν: Mark, we may be quite sure, had no thought of 'the simplest rendering "Ye shall be scourged into the synagogues"', even though it 'presents no archaeological difficulty' (Winer-Moulton[9] p. 518).

19. xiii 10 καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. 'Preached to all nations' would be a possible rendering: but when Matthew xxiv 14 wrote κηρυχθήσεται . . . ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ (Luke has no parallel), he must have taken Mark to be once more using εἰς for ἐν.

20. xiii 15, 16 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω [εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἆραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ. Both the other Synoptists recognize the clear implication of ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν 'the man in the field'; Matthew writes ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, Luke οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις. For the second time (see **16** above) they agree in the very obvious substitution of ἐν for εἰς.

21. xiv 20 ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ [ἓν] τρύβλιον. As in **16**, it is possible to argue that ἐμβάπτεσθαι implies motion, so that 'dips into the dish' could stand. But Matthew at any rate (Luke omits the whole phrase) interpreted Mark's εἰς as equivalent to ἐν, ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ. I think it not unlikely that the ἓν of B in Mark does not really mean 'the one dish' (there seems no trace in Marcan usage of τὸ ἓν = 'the same') but is the descendant of a marginal gloss suggesting the substitution of ἐν for εἰς.

These instances, taken together—even after allowance is made for the two, **2** and **10**, where ἐν appears instead of εἰς, and another **17**, where εἰς has ousted ἐπί rather than ἐν—do seem to establish a definite tendency in Marcan usage for εἰς to encroach on ἐν. That encroachment is not peculiar to Mark, though among New Testament writings there is none where the encroachment is so marked as in his Gospel. The process which was commencing in the common speech of our Lord's time has ended in the complete supersession of ἐν in modern Greek. But it was still resented by scribes and scholars, or at any rate by some of them, in the first and second centuries A.D. If Matthew regularly, and Luke frequently, are found to desert Mark's use in this respect, it is reasonable to expect that the same tendency will have influenced scribes, and not least the more skilled among them. The evidence of undoubted cases like **1**, **15**, **18**, **20**, may fairly be used to turn the scale where the evidence is divided, and justifies the conclusion that the scribe of codex B or its ancestor, admirable as is his general fidelity, did not rise superior to the temptation of altering an incorrect idiom into accordance with the traditions of literary Greek.

(*To be continued*)

C. H. Turner.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

IV. *Parenthetical clauses in Mark.*

ANCIENT manuscripts were written without signs of punctuation or even of interrogation. In the hands of a master of the Greek language its highly developed structure and its numerous particles made punctuation to a large extent superfluous, and enabled any intelligent reader to punctuate for himself as he read. But St Mark was not a master of the Greek language: and his fondness for brief co-ordinate clauses, not helped out by appropriate particles, often leaves us in doubt whether, for instance, we should read a clause interrogatively or not. Take a simple case, where both Matthew and Luke already felt the difficulty, and took care to insert words to shew which interpretation they adopted —and, in fact, one interpreted one way, and one the other: xvi 6 μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε | Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον | ἠγέρθη | οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε. Here the second clause can be punctuated either as a statement of fact (with Vulgate, A.V., R.V., and Westcott-Hort) 'Ye seek Jesus the Nazarene the Crucified', or as a question 'Are you seeking Jesus the Nazarene the Crucified?': and Matthew by prefixing the words οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι shews that he takes the former view, while Luke, writing τί ζητεῖτε, shews us as clearly that he takes the latter.[1]

The present note envisages a special group of cases where St Mark employs parenthetical clauses, and a modern writer or printer would place these within dashes or brackets. In some cases the parenthesis is so brief and so obvious that no real difficulty arises. If in vii 2 Mark writes κοιναῖς χερσίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους, 'they eat their bread with defiled, i. e. unwashed, hands', we understand of course that the Pharisees used the Aramaic equivalent of κοινός 'defiled' and that the Evangelist explains to his Gentile readers in what the defilement consisted. But in many more cases, as I think, Mark has made use of this expedient in a way which has misled scribes or commentators or both. The process of my argument would be more cogent and more logical if the clearer cases were cited first, and advance was then made from the more to the less certain. But convenience of reference appears to dictate the simpler course of taking the passages in the order of the Gospel.

[1] For a similar difficulty as to the second of three clauses see Mark i 24.

1. Mark i 1–4 Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἠσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ Ἰδοὺ . . . τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ) ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Here the *text* of Westcott-Hort (apart from the insertion of the words υἱοῦ θεοῦ, which do not concern the problem before us) is followed, but not their *punctuation*. Westcott-Hort place a full stop before καθὼς γέγραπται, and a comma after αὐτοῦ: Swete prints a full-stop in both places; Tischendorf a comma before καθώς, a full-stop after αὐτοῦ. Wellhausen wants to remove the whole of the quotation (verses 2 and 3) as not genuine, but retains the full-stop after verse 1. And in general modern exegetes are more or less agreed in segregating verse 1 as a sort of title,[1] though it is hard to see what real meaning ἀρχή has on this supposition.

But ancient exegetes had at least this advantage over modern, that they were accustomed to read unpunctuated Greek MSS, and therefore in problems of this sort especial weight attaches to their interpretation. We have only to remember how the true meaning of Mark vii 19 (no. 10 below) was rescued by Field from Origen and Chrysostom (to whom Burgon added Gregory Thaumaturgus) where modern interpreters had been baffled, and we shall be prepared on the present problem to listen respectfully to Origen, Basil, and Victor of Antioch. The two latter are quoted by Swete: Basil *c. Eunomium* ii 15 ὁ δὲ Μᾶρκος ἀρχὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὸ Ἰωάννου πεποίηκε κήρυγμα, Victor Ἰωάννην οὖν τελευταῖον τῶν προφητῶν ἀρχὴν εἶναι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου φησίν. And Origen should, I believe, be cited on the same side: *in Io.* i 13 ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου . . . ἤτοι πᾶσά ἐστιν ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη, τύπου αὐτῆς ὄντος Ἰωάννου, ἢ . . . τὰ τέλη τῆς παλαιᾶς διὰ Ἰωάννου παριστάμενα, and a few lines further on ὅθεν θαυμάζειν μοι ἔπεισι πῶς δυσὶ θεοῖς προσάπτουσιν ἀμφοτέρας τὰς διαθήκας οἱ ἑτερόδοξοι, οὐκ ἔλαττον καὶ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἐλεγχόμενοι. πῶς γὰρ δύναται ἀρχὴ εἶναι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (ὡς αὐτοὶ οἴονται ἑτέρου τυγχάνων θεοῦ) Ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἄνθρωπος; (Brooke i 17. 26, 18. 2). Place then verses 2 and 3 within brackets as a parenthesis, and construct ἀρχὴ with ἐγένετο. 'The beginning of the proclamation of good news about Jesus as Messiah and Son of God, was John the Baptizer's preaching in the wilderness of a baptism of repentance for remission of sins.'

2. ii 10, 11 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ) Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.

The parenthesis is so obvious that it is retained with practically no change by both Matthew and Luke. We could express it in English '(he turns to the paralytic)'.

[1] Lagrange *Évangile selon Saint Marc* ad loc. cites Zahn, Nestle, J. Weiss, on this side.

3. ii 15, 16 καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ—ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί, καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ—καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν . . .

The words within dashes are, I am sure, to be taken as strictly parenthetical: if they were removed altogether the main emphasis would remain unaltered—'Many "publicans and sinners"[1] sat at table with Jesus and his disciples, and the Pharisee scribes seeing that Jesus was eating with them . . .', or, as in the logical order we might put it, 'And the Pharisee scribes, seeing that many "publicans and sinners" were at the dinner with Jesus and his disciples, and that he ate freely with them . . .' The parenthesis has nothing to do with the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί. We have no reason to suppose that large numbers of revenue collectors deserted their employment to follow our Lord, nor is there anything in the rest of the Gospel to suggest it. What St Mark really does here is to lay stress on the mention, for the first time, of the word 'disciples'. Before this we have only heard from him of the call of Peter and Andrew, James and John, and perhaps of a growing company in the 'Simon and his friends' of i 36. Now in ii 15 he reminds us by the way that already a considerable body of followers had gathered round Jesus and accompanied him wherever he went: μαθηταί is the noun to be supplied with ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί. Weiss and Loisy interpret correctly: Lagrange and Swete are on the other side. Wellhausen gives two alternative explanations, but misses the true one.

4. ii 22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς—εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί—ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.

The arrangement above given (which is that adopted by Swete) is the only possible one if the last six words are genuine. They are omitted by D and many Old Latin MSS (not *e*, which borrows the full form of the verse from Matthew), but the agreement of Matthew and Luke in giving exactly these six words in common, while they provide different forms of βάλλω to complete the construction, is a strong argument for their genuineness in Mark. ℵ B, therefore, should be followed against the rest: and if εἰ δὲ μή . . . οἱ ἀσκοί is printed as a parenthesis, there is no real difficulty about the construction. But Matthew and Luke, not recognizing or not liking the parenthesis, give the final clause a construction of its own with βάλλει (Matthew) or βλητέον (Luke).

5. ii 26*b* καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν (οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς) καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν.

The case for parenthesis is less certain here, but I believe that the

[1] I do not enter here into the meaning of ἁμαρτωλοί, which requires treatment by itself: I hope later on to devote a section of these Notes to lexical usage.

L 2

words 'which only the priests are allowed to eat' is an addition by Peter or Mark to make it clear to Gentile hearers or readers in what way the instance of David and his company afforded parallel and justification for the action of Jesus and his disciples. It looks, at any rate, as if Luke felt that there was something wrong with the Marcan passage, for he transposes the words treated above as parenthetical to the end of the sentence. If they were not parenthetical, that was the natural thing to do.

Commentators have perhaps not sufficiently realized Mark's habit of introducing explanations for those unfamiliar with the details of Jewish customs, see vii 2; vii 3, 4; vii 26 *a*; xiv 36: compare the note introduced by him in xiii 14.

6. iii 22–30.

It would be misleading to print so long a passage as parenthetical: yet we lose something if the direct connexion of verse 21 with verse 31 escapes our notice. It would seem as though the Evangelist, after he has begun to tell us of the charge about our Lord that he was out of his senses, diverged to put on record the much graver charge that he was possessed by Beelzebub, and then, having dealt with that, recurs to the story he was beginning to tell and goes on to finish it. A similar case is that of the two verses viii 14, 16, which are directly connected with one another, though there it is only a single verse which intervenes. And possibly the same sort of consideration will help to unravel the complicated connexions of ix 33–50, where verses 37 and 42 are the necessary complement to one another.

7. vi 14, 15 *καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς* Ἡρῴδης (*φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι* Ἰωάννης *ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν* . . . *ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι* Ἠλείας *ἐστίν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν*)· *ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ* Ἡρῴδης *ἔλεγεν* Ὃν *ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα* Ἰωάννην, *οὗτος ἠγέρθη*.

Here ἀκούσας ὁ Ἡρῴδης is simply resumptive of ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης, 'Herod then, on hearing about Jesus, said'. The parenthetical arrangement assumes that *ἔλεγον* is the right reading in verse 14, not ἔλεγεν,[1] for the parenthesis gives the vivid popular interest in the personality of Jesus of Nazareth as the reason for his fame coming to Herod's ears.

The whole passage vi 17–29 is parenthetical in the sense that the story of the martyrdom of John the Baptist is inserted here out of its historical place. All that belongs to the period at which St Mark's narrative has arrived is just Herod's knowledge about Jesus. And perhaps it is one of the curious links that connect the Fourth Gospel with the Second, that we learn in John vi 15 (cf. Mark vi 31 *b*, 33) that

[1] See *J. T. S.* July 1924 pp. 380, 381.

there was at this time a movement, such as might naturally attract 'King' Herod's attention, to make Jesus king.

8. vii 2 ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσὶν (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις) ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους . . .

κοινός in the sense of 'unclean' does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels: but it is used throughout the story of St Peter and Cornelius in Acts x–xi, being there combined with ἀκάθαρτος. The usage is technical and Jewish, and Mark explains to his Gentile readers that it means in this case 'unwashed'. Presumably St Peter in relating the story had employed the word and intended to represent by it the actual phraseology in Aramaic employed by the Pharisees. The interpretation being editorial would best be put within brackets: cf. nos. **5** (ii 26 *b*), **9** (vii 3, 4), **11** (vii 26 *a*), **16** (xiii 14) and probably **17** (xiv 36).

From **8** to **12** inclusive there are no parallels in Luke.

9. vii 3, 4 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι . . . ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλινῶν].

The editors rightly print these verses within dashes: the Evangelist remembers that his readers would hardly understand the religious value set by the Pharisees on such an observance as washing the hands before meals, unless he correlated it with their general attitude to other similar purifications. Matthew discards the explanation: what was necessary for Gentile readers in Rome was unnecessary in Palestinian circles.

10. vii 18, 19 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν . . . ἐκπορεύεται; καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.

A very interesting example, for it shews how the Greek fathers may be better guides to the intelligent reading of the Gospels than the best equipped modern critics. Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Chrysostom saw that καθαρίζων (the reading is quite certain, though later scribes attempted to make it more grammatical, as they thought, by changing it to the neuter) goes back to the beginning of the sentence, and means that Christ when he said this 'cleansed all meats': and we owe to Dr Field *Otium Norvicense* iii (= *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* p. 31) and to Dean Burgon (*Last Twelve Verses of St Mark* p. 179 note *u*) the recovery of the true exegesis from the patristic comments. Wellhausen *ad loc.* still takes καθαρίζων with τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα! Loisy (*Les Évangiles Synoptiques* p. 965) is acquainted with the recovered interpretation, but thinks that if it is correct it can only be treated as a gloss, seeing that it 'interrupts the thread of the argument too unskilfully to be original'. But I do not think that any one who studies the series here enumerated of parentheses in the Second Gospel will accept the suggestion that unskilful interruption of the context is decisive against genuineness. If the parentheses were wholly normal and intelligible, the other Synoptists would not have got rid of them so consistently.

11. vii 25, 26 *a* ἀκούσασα γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἐλθοῦσα προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει) καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν . . .

Mark reflects as he writes that the sequel of the story will be unintelligible if he does not explain that the woman was not a Jewess either by race or religion, but on the contrary a Syrophenician in the one respect, a heathen in the other.[1] Matthew reduces the statement to the single word 'a Canaanite'—which by itself implied both things to those for whom he wrote—and put it at its logical place in the forefront of the story.

12. viii 14–17 καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἕνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. (καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων Ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ηρῴδου). καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν. καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε;

If the bracketed words are omitted from the sequence of the argument, everything seems plain sailing: and whatever explanation we give of the words in question, it can hardly be doubtful that our Lord's meaning, as reported in this Gospel, is that his disciples shewed grievous want of perception in not recognizing, after the miracles of the multiplication of the loaves, that their Master had at command a power from God to provide, if need were, their necessary food. This straightforward sequence of thought is broken by one intrusive verse. It is not an interpolation: the substance of it is present in the Matthaean parallel, and διαστέλλομαι is a characteristically Marcan word, never found in the other Gospels apart from a single passage, and that a doubtful one, in Matthew (xvi 20); Marcan, too, is the combination 'Pharisees and Herod'. The parallels give us no help: Matthew follows Mark closely. Luke omits the whole passage. But Luke, though he omits the passage, does give in quite another context (xii 1) the single verse 'Beware for yourselves of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy'. He may of course have borrowed it from this passage: it is more likely that it was in Q. Anyhow it seems that the context of 'bread' must have reminded St Mark of the saying about the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod, and he inserted it here, though strictly speaking it was foreign to the context. In other words, it must be regarded as a parenthesis, an extreme example of Mark's naïve and non-logical construction of his narrative. A modern writer would have put it in a note at the foot of

[1] I feel sure that St Mark means by Ἑλληνίς not 'Greek-speaking' (as Swete) but '*heathen*', and I think that *Matthew so understood him when he substituted* for Ἑλληνὶς Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει the single word Χαναναία. If Mark had meant 'Greek by language, Phoenician by race', he must have added something like τῇ γλώσσῃ. The normal meaning of Ἕλλην in N.T. is 'pagan', and that is precisely the sense needed to lead up to the contrast between 'children' and 'dogs'.

the page, and introduced it with the phrase 'compare . . .' The ancients, lacking such devices, were shut up within the alternatives of intercalation into the body of the text and omission. The modern editor of an ancient text, in which such intercalations occur, can only guide his readers by the typographical expedients of the dash and the bracket.

13. ix 36–42 (38–41) καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὃς ἂν ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. (Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης Διδάσκαλε, εἴδαμέν τινα . . . ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστίν. ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.) καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων, καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου . . .

In the ninth chapter of his Gospel St Mark devotes a larger proportion than hitherto to the Sayings of Christ. There are indeed in the earlier chapters episodes introduced which lead up to Sayings, and without the Sayings the episode would have no special point. Such would be, for instance, the plucking of the ears of corn, ii 23–28. But in the second half of the Gospel the training of the disciples gives more occasion to direct and systematic teaching, either not dependent upon special episodes at all, or at any rate more loosely connected with them than before. And the verses cited at the head of the paragraph exemplify this new feature of his story. It is hardly possible to suppose either that verses 35–50 are all continuous and belong to a single occasion, or that verses 35–37 record one conversation introduced by the episode of the child placed in the midst, 38–50 another conversation introduced by the remark of John. What we have is something more complex than that, and less easy to disentangle.

As in the last passage treated, no. 12, it seems likely that the Evangelist has interwoven with one another Sayings originally independent, though very probably belonging to the same cycle of teaching. And the method of combination seems to be on the same lines as before: a word or phrase brings to the writer's mind another Saying on a similar topic and he sets it down, returning later on to the original topic. The intervening words may once more be treated as an example of Mark's fondness for parenthesis.

If we read verses 37 and 42 consecutively, it is difficult not to think that they are connected with one another. 'Whosoever shall receive one of such children as this, receiveth me . . . and whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe, it were better for him . . .' St Mark will have inserted the episode of John's remark and the Lord's

answer, because it seemed to him to illustrate the same general idea; but having so inserted it, he returns to the topic from which he started and completes the saying which the parenthesis had interrupted.

Wellhausen, too, points out the connexion of verses 37 and 42. But he brings an arbitrary element into his exegesis of the passage by making a contrast between verses 43 and following, which he regards as genuine words of Christ, and verses 42 and preceding which appear to him to imply the period of the Apostolic age and not the period of the Ministry. He follows D in verse 40, reading ὑμῶν for ἡμῶν, 'Whosoever is not against you is with you', and supposes that the Evangelist or his authority has in his mind attempts in the primitive community to dispense with the leadership of the Twelve. Even if he is right in the reading he adopts, there is an obvious objection to his interpretation which he has not attempted to meet. The Gospel according to Mark puts in the foreground the selection of the Twelve and their subsequent training, and not less the prominence of Peter as spokesman of the inner company of the disciples. If there was in the early Church any tendency to minimize the one or the other, it certainly could not be proved from our Second Gospel. Except on the postulate that Jesus cannot have contemplated the continued existence of preaching in his name after his death, it is surely far simpler and more reasonable to suppose that the Saying or Sayings which inculcate the principle laid down in these verses came from no other lips than his.

14. xii 12 *a* καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι (καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον), ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν.

Obviously the recognition on the part of the Jewish authorities that the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen had been directed against them, was the reason not for their fear of the multitude but for their desire to arrest Jesus. The words 'and they feared the multitude' interrupt the connexion, and it is from that point of view necessary to bracket them. The Evangelist ought logically to have put first the reason for the desire before mentioning the obstacle which interfered with its fulfilment.

The sense is clear enough, and Luke (xx 19) left Mark's order of the clauses unaltered. Matthew (xxi 46) felt a difficulty in the sentence as it stood, and substitutes a reason for their fearing the people in place of Mark's reason for their desire to arrest Jesus: 'they feared the multitudes because they [the multitudes] held him for a prophet.'

15. xiii 9–11 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς—καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον—καὶ ὅταν, ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε . . .

The connexion of verses 9 and 11 is obvious: it is broken by verse

10 which Luke in his parallel passage (xxi 13, 14) and Matthew in an earlier parallel (x 18, 19) entirely omit, while Matthew at this point (xxiv 9) transfers the verse to the end of the section (after Mark xiii 13) *καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος.* This Matthaean paraphrase does probably supply the answer to the two questions which suggest themselves about the Marcan parenthesis. In the first place it is the words *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* which give the cue for the parenthetic reference to the preaching of the Gospel to all nations: in the second place *πρῶτον* is correctly interpreted by Matthew to mean 'before the end come'.

16. xiii 14 *ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω), τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ . . .*

An obvious and acknowledged parenthesis, copied by Matthew, omitted by Luke. Whether Matthew retained it because he understood what it meant, whether Luke omitted it because he saw that it was no longer necessary, I am not sure: but I am quite sure what Mark meant by it.

In the first place *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων* has nothing to do with the Reader, or with any reading of the Gospel in the Christian congregation. It would be an anachronism to suppose that the Evangelist contemplated the use of his Gospel in public worship: and it is a pure misunderstanding of the meaning of *ἀναγινώσκειν* to suppose that it excludes private reading. It was the custom of the ancients to read aloud to themselves: St Augustine relates it of St Ambrose as something unusual that he read to himself, as we do, without using his voice.[1] Mark simply means 'my readers'.

In the second place *νοεῖν*, as in Apoc. xiii 18 *ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω*, means 'to read between the lines', 'to penetrate below the surface'. Evangelist and Apocalyptist alike mean something that neither can afford to put down in black and white. In both cases there is veiled

[1] Aug *Confess.* vi 3 (ed. Ben. i 121) 'Sed cum legebat, oculi ducebantur per paginas, et cor intellectum rimabatur, uox autem et lingua quiescebant. saepe cum adessemus (non enim uetabatur quisquam ingredi aut ei uenientem nuntiari mos erat), sic eum legentem vidimus tacite, et aliter numquam; sedentesque in diuturno silentio—quis enim tam intento esse oneri auderet?—discedebamus, et coniectabamus eum, paruo ipso tempore quod reparandae menti suae nanciscebatur, feriatum ab strepitu causarum alienarum nolle in aliud auocari et cauere fortasse ne, auditore suspenso et intento, si qua obscurius posuisset ille quem legeret etiam exponere necesse esset aut de aliquibus difficilioribus disceptare quaestionibus, atque huic operi temporibus impensis minus quam uellet uoluminum euolueret: quamquam et causa seruandae uocis, quae illi facillime obtundebatur, poterat esse iustior tacite legendi. quolibet tamen animo id ageret, bono utique ille uir agebat.' I owe this reference to my colleague, Prof. J. A. Smith.

reference to the Roman power, and just as St Paul conceals allusion to empire and emperor by employing both masculine and neuter, ὁ κατέχων and τὸ κατέχον, in 2 Thess. ii 6, 7, so St Mark with a bold disregard of grammar writes τὸ βδέλυγμα ἑστηκότα because he wants to indicate that Daniel's 'abomination of desolation' has a human reference. Matthew, seeing in the capture of the Temple the fulfilment of the prediction, paraphrases 'standing in the holy place': Mark, writing with the prediction still unfulfilled—though it is possible that the Jewish war had already broken out—reproduces, we may well believe, the very phrase employed by Jesus, and adds to it parenthetically his own comment.

Wellhausen *ad loc.* goes preposterously wrong. 'The warning to the reader to take note', he says, 'fits only with the context of Matthew, where express reference is made to Daniel—the reader of Daniel, that is, is to note how his prophecy is fulfilled—and has therefore been inserted in Mark out of Matthew'. If critics would take a little more trouble to master the meaning of the words before them, counsel would less often be darkened, and textual problem and Synoptic problem would arrive more speedily and surely at solution. Wellhausen's work is full of acute exegesis: but this comment is perverse.

17. xiv 36 Ἀββὰ (ὁ πατήρ).

So St Paul in Gal. iv 6, Rom. viii 15. The early Church as we know it was, as were all the Jews of the Dispersion from Alexandria round to Rome, Greek-speaking. But just as Greek survived in the Roman church and other Western churches for purposes of worship after it had ceased to be the language of ordinary speech—witness the *Agios agios agios* of Saturus's vision in the Acts of Perpetua—just as Latin has remained the liturgical language of south-western Europe, or Old Slavonic of Slav Churches, or Coptic of the Monophysite church of Egypt, so Aramaic phrases survived in the Greek-speaking churches founded by St Paul. The ἀββά of the Christians of Galatia and Rome, the μαρὰν ἀθά of the Christians of Corinth, are like the *Kyrie eleison* in the Latin liturgy of to-day.[1]

What then of ὁ πατήρ? It is the Greek equivalent inserted to explain the ἀββά for those of the congregation who were ignorant of Aramaic. I cannot think (with Sanday and Headlam on Rom. viii 15) that we are to suppose that our Lord used both words in his prayer—any more than he used Greek as well as Aramaic on the other occasions on which St Mark records the actual Aramaic (or Hebrew[2]) words employed by

[1] I do not mean to assert that the *Kyrie* in the Mass goes back to the second or third century, though I am not convinced to the contrary. But there is at any rate some probability that the *Agios agios agios* of Mozarabic and Gallican books is a survival rather than a later introduction.

[2] In Mark xv 34 I believe the true text to be that of D *k* (with some support from other Old Latins and B) ἠλεὶ ἠλεὶ λαμὰ ζαφθάνει (עֲזַבְתָּנִי); that is to say, that the

him. Ὁ πατήρ, then, is one more of St Mark's parentheses. But it differs from his other parentheses in being provided for him, so to say, ready made. It was in familiar use—possibly in connexion with the Lord's Prayer—in the church of the Apostolic age. But St Mark's testimony is the last that we have for it. After the destruction of Jerusalem the Aramaic element in Greek-speaking Christianity disappeared. Matthew and Luke agree in substituting Πάτερ for the earlier Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

18. xvi 3, 4 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; (καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀνακεκύλισται ὁ λίθος) ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

I cannot doubt that St Mark's motive in the words 'for it was very great' was to account for the anxiety of the women to find help in the rolling away of the stone. If it had been a small one, they could have rolled it away unaided: as it is, they doubt their own capacity to do so without assistance. The parenthesis explains that after all their anxiety was unnecessary: the stone had been, not indeed rolled away, but shifted, 'rolled a little' (κυλισθεὶς ἐπεχώρησε παρὰ μέρος, *Ev. Petri*), sufficiently to permit of their entrance. The structure of the sentence closely resembles that of xii 12, no. 14 *supra*.

The detail is so unimportant that it can only have come from the artless narrative of one who was relating individual experience. Fortunately perhaps for us, the Evangelist was no more given to distinguishing the essential and the unessential features of a story than was his informant, and it re-appeared untrimmed in his record. Matthew, true to his methods of condensation, omits the whole episode of the two verses, though he has transferred to his account of the entombment, a few verses higher up, the detail that the stone was 'great': Luke simply states that the women found 'the stone' rolled away from the sepulchre, but he had said nothing of the closing of the tomb and no doubt simply means his readers to understand that the normal proceeding had been adopted, and the tomb closed with a slab which was now found 'rolled away'.

19. xvi 7 εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι Προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν—ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε—καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν.

The natural exegesis of these words, if printed without punctuation

Evangelist reports our Lord's cry according to the Hebrew of the Psalm and not in Aramaic (שְׁבַקְתַּנִי): Matthew substituted the Aramaic, and the Matthaean reading, as so often elsewhere, has ousted the original reading in St Mark. On our Lord's knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures see Dr Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ* p. 107 f. That he should have used the Hebrew of a familiar Scripture in a dying ejaculation is just as natural as it would be for a Roman Catholic to use the Latin of the Vulgate.

or brackets, is that our Lord had told the disciples that they would see him in Galilee. But the Gospel contains no record of any such Saying. Matthew, therefore, by substituting the first person for the third, εἶπον for εἶπεν, changes the sense from a prediction of our Lord's to a statement by the angel, 'You will see him in Galilee: I tell you so categorically'.[1] Luke retains the third person; but as his Gospel records appearances of the Risen Christ in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood only, he has to connect Galilee not with the appearances but with the prediction, 'He spake yet being in Galilee'. But St Mark had recorded one prediction by Jesus, uttered as recently as the Last Supper (xiv 28), μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, in language of which the angel's words seem an obvious echo, xvi 6, 7, ἠγέρθη . . . προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν . . . καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. Apart from the three intrusive words, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, the correspondence is exact. Treat them as a parenthesis after the Marcan manner, place them between dashes, and all difficulty disappears.

C. H. TURNER.

SOME TENDENCIES IN OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

FOR some time past there have been striking developements in Old Testament Criticism. Even fifteen years ago Dr Skinner could remark that 'O. T. scholars have a good many new eras dawning on them just now', although, as he immediately added, 'whether any of them will shine unto the perfect day, time will show'.[2] And, in fact, no new era has as yet appeared, although it can justly be said that tendencies to pass beyond or away from the current 'Wellhausen' position are considerably stronger and more significant than they were in 1910. Much could be said upon the nature and value of these tendencies, but it will be convenient for the present to confine our remarks to a couple of books which can be regarded as symptomatic of the conviction that some new stage in O. T. criticism is necessary. In one of them a German writer, Martin Kegel, Ph.D. (Eng. trans., *Away from Wellhausen*, Murray), offers what the sub-title describes as 'a contribution to the new orientation in O. T. study'. In the other (*The Code of Deuteronomy*, James Clarke) Prof. Adam C. Welch of Edinburgh publishes what the 'jacket' styles 'a singularly courageous book', and not

[1] Hort *ad loc.* proposes to restore εἶπεν in the text of Matthew. But I think Matthew was puzzled by Mark's statement as he understood it, and deliberately altered it: unless indeed he read εἶπον in his copy of Mark. In either case, ἰδού appears to me to exclude εἶπεν. It introduces a new speaker.

[2] Commentary on *Genesis* (1910) p. xliii; cf. *J. T. S.* xii (1911) p. 467.

The Journal of Theological Studies

APRIL, 1925

NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL (*continued*).

V. *The movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd.*

THE present instalment of these Notes on Marcan Usage deals with what seems to me a singularly interesting feature of the Second Gospel in comparison and contrast with the other two Synoptic Gospels, namely the position and relative prominence which in the structure of the narrative attaches to the disciples or the Twelve. This prominence is not to all appearance the result of a conscious attempt on the evangelist's part to emphasize it or in any way to advertise it: you might read the Gospel superficially without noticing it: but when once attention is drawn to it, it is seen to be there, and the natural and obvious explanation is that we have before us the experience of a disciple and apostle who tells the story from the point of view of an eyewitness and companion, who puts himself in the same group as the Master, who distinguishes the group of companions from the crowd at large. Matthew and Luke are Christian historians who stand away from the events, and concentrate their narrative on the central figure: in contrast with it other contrasts lose something of their importance, and on occasion the disciples and the crowd almost melt—as they never do in Mark—into one.

The first and perhaps of all the most significant distinction between the three Synoptists in this sphere is the distinction between the use of the plural and of the singular in the narrative of the movements of Jesus and his disciples. Twenty-one instances are enumerated in § 1 of these notes, in which the plural is used by Mark, denoting the coming and going of Jesus and his disciples—in fifteen of them the word is ἔρχεσθαι or one of its compounds—followed at once by the singular in reference to Jesus alone. Obviously it was simpler and saved space to construct

the whole sentence in the singular, and this is what the other Synoptists, concentrating attention on the Master, tend to do: on five occasions both substitute the singular for the plural, and on three more occasions Luke does so, while Luke five times and Matthew three times omit the whole clause containing the plural verb. The net result is that the retention of Mark's plural is rare in Matthew, rarer still in Luke. And the scribes of Mark, whether affected by the presence of the singular in the Synoptic parallels, or influenced independently by the same motives as influenced Matthew and Luke, tend themselves too to get rid of the plural: and in one or two cases it is not unreasonable to allow 'Marcan usage' a decisive voice and to accept the plural on what is apparently the weaker body of witness.

Why then did our earliest Evangelist tell his story in the plural, not being himself one of the company who went about with Jesus, save because he is repeating the story of one to whom the plural came natural as being himself an actor in the events he relates? 'We went across, and as he left the boat there met him . . .' 'Next morning after we had left Bethany he was hungry . . .' 'We come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking up and down in the Temple . . .' The mixture of nominatives is less glaring between the first person and the third—'we' and 'he', instead of 'they' and 'he': and that may perhaps be the reason why St Mark so rarely writes 'Jesus'. Peter would be content with 'He': there could be no question who was meant.[1]

In one passage in particular, i 29, 'they left the synagogue and came into the house of Simon and Andrew with James and John', the hypothesis that the third person plural of Mark represents a first person plural of Peter makes what as it stands is a curiously awkward phrase into a phrase which is quite easy and coherent. 'We left the synagogue and came into our house with our fellow-disciples James and John. My mother-in-law was in bed with fever, and he is told about her . . .'[2] So too, i 16, 'He saw me and Andrew my brother'.

The usages of which details are given in the other sections of this paper are all intended to re-inforce the conclusion that Mark's story is told as from a disciple and companion, while Matthew and Luke are less directly interested in that particular point of view.

[1] Mark very rarely writes ὁ Ἰησοῦς in narrative, not infrequently in the give and take of question and answer: though scribes have tried to insert it, e. g. xii 41. Matthew adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς not less than some forty times, especially at the beginning of a paragraph. Luke is even more sparing than Mark with ὁ Ἰησοῦς, and like Mark, but oftener, makes use of αὐτός, 'He himself', 'The Master', or better still a stressed 'He': it is almost equivalent to our use of the capital H.

[2] My colleague Mr Brightman points out to me that this suggestion was anticipated by Godet: see his *Biblical Studies: New Testament* ch. i § 2, p. 24.

In § ii nine passages are enumerated where the sentence begins with a singular verb in reference to our Lord and goes on to mention the disciples: and more often than not this mention of the disciples falls out in one or both of the derivative accounts.

The passages collected in the following section (§ 3) differ only from these by the additional mention of the crowd. They witness to the more articulated conceptions of the Second Gospel: in later Gospels the lines become a little blurred and indistinct. Out of eleven passages there is practically none where something of the Marcan distinction of elements is not lost by both the other two evangelists.

This definite articulation, characteristic of Mark, is further brought out with regard to 'the crowd', ὄχλος, in § v. Alone among the three Synoptists he uses the word only in the singular—the one exception in x 1 refers to the gathering together of crowds from different quarters—because he or his informant visualizes as a single whole the body of people who came together to hear Jesus, and according to their numbers on each occasion describes them as 'a crowd' or 'a big crowd' or 'a considerable crowd' or 'a very big crowd'. Mark never uses the definite article in the nominative, ὁ ὄχλος, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος (at any rate till the scene shifts to Jerusalem), except in relation to an indefinite 'crowd' mentioned just previously.[1] They are not a fixed quantity, so to say, not ὁ ὄχλος but ὄχλος, a necessary element in the picture but a variable and varying one. To the other evangelists, or at any rate to Matthew, they are a stereotyped but vague generality, 'the multitudes'.

A similar conclusion results from the study of the word ἀκολουθεῖν in § vi. In Mark this verb has ordinarily something still about it to suggest the literal sense: it is never used of the crowds—as it is in the other Synoptists—but only of the call to 'leave all and follow' Jesus. And more significant still are the changes which the two later Synoptists make by introducing ἀκολουθεῖν of the disciples 'following' Jesus, where Mark had spoken of Jesus and the disciples as a single group; see iv 36, ix 38.[2]

Finally, as to the terms used of the disciples themselves, St Mark's Gospel reveals its archaic and primitive character by its predominant

[1] ὁ ὄχλος in iii 20 (but note ὄχλος ℵ* C with W-H margin) would refer to the πλῆθος πολύ of iii 8: in ix 25 (but again ὄχλος ℵ^c B D Δ) to the ὄχλον πολύν of ix 14: πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος (ὄχλος D*) ii 13 to the πολλοί of ii 2 and the διὰ τὸν ὄχλον of ii 4: πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος of iv 1 *b* to ὄχλος πλεῖστος earlier in the same verse, and in ix 15 to ὄχλον πολύν of ix 14. In xv 8 D a k give, for 'the crowd', 'the whole crowd'. In oblique cases the article is of course essential, and implies nothing as between ὄχλος and ὁ ὄχλος: e.g. in ii 4 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον was the only possible phrase, just like 'because of the crowd' in English. You could not say δι' ὄχλον, 'because of a crowd'.

[2] Of the crowd Matt. iv 25, viii 1, xii 15, xiv 13, xix 2, xx 29; Lk vii 9, ix 11: and of the disciples Matt. viii 23, Lk. ix 49, xxii 39.

use of the phrase 'his disciples' (§ iv below); whereas the other Gospels tend to introduce the absolute statement 'the disciples', a usage which doubtless goes back to a very early stage in the separate history of the Christian Society but does not go back to the time of the Ministry itself. And St Mark's Gospel is distinguished again from the other two by its fondness, especially in the later chapters, for the phrase οἱ δώδεκα, which comes to all appearance to be practically a synonym, during the last journey to Jerusalem and at Jerusalem, for 'the disciples'.[1]

i. *The impersonal plural, followed by the singular.*

1. i 21 καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν.

The plural is found in all authorities save *fam.* 1 Origen and a very few others (*om.* syr-sin). Matthew omits the notice entirely: Luke gives the singular; but as the call of the first disciples comes at a later point in his story, he was naturally bound to do so.

2. i 29, 30 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος . . . καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ . . .

ἐξελθόντες . . . ἦλθον ℵ A C L Δ Vulg. with W-H text: B D W Θ *fam.* 1, *fam.* 13 and the Old Latins and Armenian ἐξελθὼν . . . ἦλθεν: syr-sin combines the two readings 'and he went forth . . . and they came', and so l 'et protinus egrediens de synagoga uenerunt': a and the Sahidic are defective. Matthew and Luke both have the singular. It is so much more probable that the singular would have been substituted for the plural by scribes of Mark than *vice versa*, that, in spite of the strong authority for ἐξελθὼν . . . ἦλθεν, I can feel little doubt that W-H are right in putting the plural in their text.[2]

3. v 1, 2 καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν . . . καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ . . .

ἦλθεν C L W Δ etc. syr-sin. Matthew omits the first clause altogether: Luke has the plural with Mark. External authority and intrinsic probability combined are decisive for ἦλθον.

4. v 38 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου· καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον . . .

ἔρχονται ℵ A B C D 1 33, the better half of Old Latin MSS (b e i) Vulg. and Sahidic: ἔρχεται L W Θ a c ff arm: def. syr-sin. Matthew and Luke both substitute the singular. There is no doubt about the

[1] I hope to recur in another number of the Journal to this subject, and to examine the theory urged by Eduard Meyer in his important work *Ursprung und Anfange des Christentums*, that οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ) and οἱ δώδεκα indicate two separate sources employed by St Mark. As far as I can see at present, this theory has no adequate basis at all.

[2] In Mk. ii 13 ℵ* gives ἐξῆλθον for ἐξῆλθεν: but though it may conceivably be right, the authority is too slight to justify the inclusion of the passage in this list.

reading in Mark: exactly the same instinct which actuated the other two Synoptists accounts for the reading of the minority.

5. vi 53, 54 καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν. καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν . . .

Luke is now defective: Matthew retains the first plurals, διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον, but drops the other two as superfluous detail.[1]

6. viii 22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ . . .

ἔρχονται ℵ^c B C D L W Δ Θ *fam.* 13 Latins Sahidic Armenian: ἔρχεται ℵ* A syr-sin etc. Again no doubt at all: but again we note the persistent inclination by some or other witnesses to substitute the singular. There are no Synoptic parallels.

7. ix 14, 15 καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν . . . καὶ εὐθὺς πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθάμβησαν.

ἐλθόντες . . . εἶδον ℵ B L W Δ k sah arm: ἐλθὼν . . . εἶδεν A C D Θ and all latins except k, etc.: syr-sin, as in no. 2, gives a conflate reading 'when he came to his disciples, they saw by them a great multitude'. Both Matthew and Luke keep the plural of Mark, though Matthew, as on some other occasions, omits all mention of the multitude. There are only eight witnesses (or nine, if we count syr-sin) for the plural in Mark, but their quality makes up for their quantity. Note that k is the only MS of the Westerns (in the literal sense) in the group: it preserves on not a few occasions a purer text than D.

8. ix 30 κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ.

This time there is no variation in our witnesses, and Matthew, too, retains the plural: Luke omits the whole clause, perhaps because he is going a few verses later to introduce his special story of the ascent to Jerusalem.

9. ix 33 καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ· καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς . . .

ἦλθον ℵ B D W *fam.* 1 the best Old Latins (a b i k) with Vulgate and Sahidic: ἦλθεν A C L Δ Θ etc. Matthew and Luke both omit the details of the arrival at Capernaum and entry into the house. Once more there is no doubt about the reading.

10. x 32 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα . . .

The form of the sentence precluded any temptation to scribes of Mark to evade the plural: but Matthew changes ἀναβαίνοντες to ἀναβαίνων and goes straight on with παρέλαβεν τοὺς δώδεκα, while Luke omits

[1] From vii 24 to vii 37—the visit to Tyre, and return from Tyre to the sea of Galilee—the story is told throughout in the singular. May not our Lord have made this excursion alone and unaccompanied?

everything which precedes παραλαβών. Thus in both of them the plural entirely disappears.

11. x 46 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰερειχώ. καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰερειχὼ . . .

ἔρχεται D with most of the Old Latins (but not c k) syr-sin and Origen. Matthew keeps the plural: Luke replaces the plural by the singular.

12. xi 1 καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . . ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

A very limited group, D and the Old Latins (with the exception of a), substitutes the singular, at the same time changing the present to a past tense: k, for the first time since it has come to our assistance (from no. 7 onwards), deserts the plural. As in no. 11, Matthew retains the plural, while Luke gives ἤγγισεν.

13. xi 11 καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς Ἱερόσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα . . .

Here I read the plural with a very small group, Θ i (cum introissent) k (et introiuerunt): syr-sin as in nos. 2 and 7, combines plural and singular 'and they entered Jerusalem, and he entered the Temple'. All our other authorities, with Matthew and Luke, have the singular. But, on the strength of 'Marcan usage', I venture to believe that the three authorities which give the plural are right.

14. xi 12 καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας ἐπείνασεν.

The only recalcitrant witnesses here are D b c ff—not however a d i k. Thus the older Old Latins go with our Greek authorities: the ungrammatical ἐξελθόντα of D, where d has cum exissent, may safely be neglected. Matthew has the singular: Luke has no parallel.

15. xi 15 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν . . .

The singular is only offered by D (again against its Latin column intrauerunt) b i and syr-sin. Matthew and Luke both omit the first clause, and therewith the plural, entirely.

16. xi 19, 20, 21 ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως· καὶ παραπορευόμενοι πρωὶ εἶδον τὴν συκῆν . . . καὶ ἀναμνησθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ . . .

ἐξεπορεύοντο A B W Δ Ψ 124 565 c d arm W-H text: ἐξεπορεύετο the rest (with Θ k sah syr-sin). There is no parallel in the other Synoptists to account for the singular: and as παραπορευόμενοι εἶδον is quite certain, it is just possible that ἐξεπορεύοντο is a scribal assimilation to this following plural, and that ἐξεπορεύετο is original here. Decision is therefore less easy than usual.

17. xi 27 καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ . . .

ἔρχεται only D with all the older Old Latins (b e ff i k) except a:

compare no. **12** above. Matthew has the singular: Luke omits the first phrase, and so retains only the singular.

18. xiv 18 *καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων ὁ Ἰησοῦς*[1] *εἶπεν* . . .

Matthew retains (omitting *ἀνακειμένων καί*), Luke puts *ἀνέπεσεν* (singular) into a previous verse, and thus gets rid again of the plural.

19. xiv 22 *καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον* . . .

Matthew retains plural and singular: Luke again omits the phrase containing the plural.

20. xiv 26, 27 *καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον* . . . *καὶ λέγει αὐτοῦς ὁ Ἰησοῦς* . . .

Matthew again retains unchanged: Luke again omits *ὑμνήσαντες* and, instead of 'they went out', writes 'he went out and they followed'.

21. xiv 32 *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸ χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεί· καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ* . . .

No variation in the text of Mark: but both Matthew and Luke change plural into singular.

Of the fourteen passages where our authorities differ, B is right in 12, ℵ in 11, W in 10, Θ in 9, sah in 11, a in 8, d in 8: k in six out of nine where it is extant. D and syr. sin have the worst record: on three occasions running, **14 15 16**, d is right where D is wrong.

ii. *The singular followed by mention of the disciples* (*or the Twelve*).

1. i 35, 36 *καὶ πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν* . . . *καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*. They are not yet 'the disciples', still less 'the Twelve', but 'Simon and his companions'. Peter takes the first place—or it was Peter who told the story, 'I and my companions'. There is no parallel in Matthew, while in Luke (iv 42) *οἱ ὄχλοι* take the place of *Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*.[1]

2. ii 15 *καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.*

Matthew repeats Mark's statement: Luke omits the mention of the disciples.

3. ii 23 *καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν* . . . *παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο* . . .

The mention of the disciples at this point is necessary to the story, and is repeated by both the other Synoptists.

4. iii 7 *καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν* . . .

It is Matthew on this occasion who omits mention of the disciples, while Luke follows Mark by retaining it.

[1] *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* is omitted by a e ff syr-sin, and the place of the words varies in our other authorities: see p. 2 note 1 above.

5. vi 1 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

Matthew is wholly silent about the disciples here, because they play no part in the episode. Luke, too, omits them, and necessarily, for he transfers this visit to Nazareth to a point in his history (iv 16) before the call of any of the disciples.

6. viii 27 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καισαρίας τῆς Φιλίππου.

The question to the disciples 'Whom do men say that I am?' is of course an integral part of this story, and all three Evangelists mention them in that connexion: but in the introductory phrase Matthew drops the allusion to them.

7. x 13 καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία . . . οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς . .

The rebuke by the disciples being necessary to the episode, it is retained by both the derivative accounts.

8. xiv 12, 13 καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων . . . λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν . . .

Strictly speaking, this passage does not fulfil the requirement of singular before plural: but I include it here for purposes of comparison with St Luke, for it illustrates again the underlying principle that Mark tells the story from the point of view of the disciples. While Matthew exactly reproduces, Luke omits the initiative of the disciples, and writes (xxii 7, 8) ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων . . . καὶ ἀπέστειλεν . . .

9. xiv 17 καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα . . .

The other two Synoptists agree, save that for 'the Twelve' Matthew substitutes 'the twelve disciples', Luke 'the apostles'.

These variations are instructive. Mark uses οἱ δώδεκα ten times: iii 14, 16 ἐποίησεν [τοὺς] δώδεκα, iv 10 οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, vi 7 προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, ix 35 καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, x 32 παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, xi 11 ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα, xiv 10 Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριὼθ ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, xiv 17 (the passage under discussion), xiv 20 εἷς τῶν δώδεκα ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ, xiv 43 παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰούδας, εἷς τῶν δώδεκα—and only once[1] οἱ ἀπόστολοι, and that on the special occasion when they returned from the Missionary Journey, vi 30, where the noun corresponds to the ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο of vi 7 (cf. iii 15, of the purpose of the call of the Twelve, ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν . . .): neither οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί nor οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι occurs in his Gospel. In other words ἀπόστολος has not lost with him its

[1] In Mk. iii 14 the words οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, in spite of the strong authority for them (ℵ B Δ Θ 28 Ferrar group sah), are in my judgement nothing but an insertion borrowed from Lk. vi 13. They are omitted by Tischendorf with A D L W 1 33 all latins (O.L. and Vulg) syr-sin arm.

original sense of 'missionary', and there were other qualified 'missionaries' in the early Church besides the Twelve, while οἱ δώδεκα 'the Twelve' is the special phrase which in the latter part of his Gospel (side by side with οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ) denotes the small company of those whom the Master had singled out for closest intimacy and training as his representatives. Here the Pauline epistles are the best commentary on Marcan usage. St Paul does not use οἱ δώδεκα himself: but we find the phrase in the Creed-summary of 1 Cor. xv 5, which he had 'received' from, and shared with, those who were in Christ before him. Similarly St Paul recognizes the original sense of ἀπόστολος as a 'missionary' 'one formally sent' (2 Cor. viii 23, Phil. ii 25), and can even write, in the additions which he makes in 1 Cor. xv 6–8 to the inherited Creed-form, τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν (verse 7) in contrast to τοῖς δώδεκα of verse 5.

On the other hand Matthew never uses the phrase οἱ δώδεκα (save in the phrase εἷς τῶν δώδεκα xxvi 14 = Mk. xiv 10, and xxvi 47 = Mk. xiv 43), but always οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί, Matt. x 1, xi 1, xx 17 [1], xxvi 20, or οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι, Matt. x 2: in Matt. x 5 τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα may seem an exception, but it takes up οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι of verse 2. That is to say, though Matthew can say εἷς τῶν δώδεκα or οὗτοι οἱ δώδεκα, he never says οἱ δώδεκα *simpliciter*. Like Mark, he only uses ἀπόστολος once, but it is significant that on that one occasion (x 2) it is in reference to the call of 'the twelve apostles': cf. Apoc. xxi 14 'the twelve apostles of the Lamb'.

Luke does not share Matthew's avoidance of the phrase 'the Twelve': Lk. viii 1, ix 1 [2], ix 12, xviii 31, xxii 3, xxii 47. But he is the first evangelist to introduce, as an alternative to 'the disciples' or 'the Twelve' the additional phrase 'the Apostles'—which in the Acts he uses of course quite regularly and consistently—Lk. ix 10 [= Mk. vi 30], xvii 5, xxii 14, xxiv 10. Like Matthew, but unlike Mark, he uses the noun 'apostles' in connexion with the Calling of the Twelve, vi 13.

Our passage, Mk. xiv 17 = Matt. xxvi 20 = Lk. xxii 14, is therefore of special interest as indicating characteristic usages of the three Synoptists, οἱ δώδεκα, οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί, οἱ ἀπόστολοι.

[1] τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς B C W 28 33 Ferrar group latins (O.L. and Vulg.) sah and W-H margin. The authority would be preponderant, even without the argument from Matthaean usage. Omission of μαθητάς is due to the influence of the parallel texts in Luke and Mark.

[2] There is good, and perhaps sufficient, authority for adding ἀποστόλους, ℵ C L Θ 33 Ferrar group a c e Vulg.

iii. *The Lord, the disciples, and the multitude.*

1. iii 9 *καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτόν.*

Mention of the disciples at this moment disappears entirely from Matthew and Luke. It had, in fact, no point save as a personal reminiscence.

2. iv 1, 2, 10 *καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλεῖστος . . . καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν. καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά . . . καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς.*

Here in Mark we have four elements, the Lord, the Twelve, the disciples outside the Twelve, and lastly the multitude. The intermediate elements distinguished by Mark—the Twelve are now a group by themselves among the disciples, but they are not yet isolated into a separate company—are massed together both by Matthew ('the disciples') and Luke ('his disciples'). All three share mention of the 'crowd', but Luke suppresses all details, and even in Matthew the detail disappears that the crowd was unusually big, πλεῖστος. Ὄχλοι πολλοί is a sort of standing phrase with him (Matt. iv 25, viii 1, xiii 2 [our passage], xv 30, xix 2), though he does employ ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος in xxi 8.

3. iv 34 *χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.*

Luke is not parallel here: Matthew retains the first or negative part of the sentence and caps it with a prophecy (Ps. lxxviii [lxxvii] 2), but says nothing of the interpretation to the disciples.

4. iv 35, 36 *καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς . . . Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.*

Both Matthew and Luke are silent as to the action of the disciples; ἀφέντες and παραλαμβάνουσιν alike disappear. In Luke the 'crowd' drops out as well.

5. vii 17 *καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς [τὸν] οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.*

We have reached the long lacuna in Luke: Matthew, who has inserted additional matter since the mention of the summoning of the crowd (Mk. vii 14 = Matt. xv 10) has no place here for the crowd, and loses the characteristic Marcan contrast of ὄχλος and μαθηταί.

6. viii 1 *πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς . . .*

There is, as before, no Luke: Matthew retains the substance, but by compressing misses Mark's juxtaposition of 'crowd' and 'disciples'.

7. viii 9, 10 ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι· καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς. καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς [αὐτὸς] εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν . . .

Matthew for the rest copies Mark meticulously, but he omits the disciples altogether and emphasizes his concentration on the Lord and the multitude by repeating the noun ὄχλος (τοὺς ὄχλους for αὐτούς).

8. viii 34 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς . . .

Mark's characteristic combination of the crowd and the disciples fails as usual to find full echo in the other two Synoptists: for Matthew here omits the crowd, and Luke groups both elements together under the common heading πάντας.

9. ix 14 καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτούς . . .

Mark is careful to note that Jesus, who had selected three of the disciples to accompany him on the Mount of the Transfiguration, now once more reunited the company. That does not in itself interest the other Synoptists: both of them note the crowd, neither of them says anything at this stage of the disciples.

10. x 46 καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰερειχὼ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ . . .

Matthew (xx 29) avoids the separate mention of 'disciples' by the use of the plural participle ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν, and connects the 'crowd' by the expedient of his favourite word ἀκολουθέω.[1] Luke concentrates attention on the principal actors, Jesus and the blind beggar, leaves out the disciples altogether, but skilfully introduces the crowd when the blind man hears it passing by.

11. xii 41–43 καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν . . . καὶ ἐλθοῦσα μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλεν . . . καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν . . .

Matthew omits the whole story. Luke tells it without any specific reference to the disciples.

iv. '*His disciples*' '*the disciples*' (οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, οἱ μαθηταί).

Very early in the history of the Christian Society, μαθητής, οἱ μαθηταί, became the regular term for an individual follower of Jesus of Nazareth or for the members of the Society generally: and it is so used throughout the Acts. It is earlier than the word 'Christian', which, being of Latin or Greek coinage, belongs only to the period when Christianity began to establish itself in Gentile centres: Acts xi 26 ἐγένετο . . . χρηματίσαι πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. As contrasted with 'Nazarene', it is the term which the followers of Jesus used of

[1] On ἀκολουθεῖν see below p. 238.

themselves, while to the Jews they were 'the Nazarenes', Acts xxiv 5 πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων[1] αἱρέσεως.

But originally, when 'disciples' collected first round Jesus of Nazareth, his were not the only disciples. There were 'disciples of John', there were 'disciples of the Pharisees', Mk. ii 18, Lk. v 33, vii 18, xi 1, Jo. i 35, iii 25; and therefore the followers of Jesus in his Ministry were not 'the disciples' but 'his disciples', not οἱ μαθηταί but οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

This was of course the phraseology of the Jews[2]: 'Why are the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees fasting, but thy disciples are not fasting?' 'Why do not thy disciples walk according to the tradition of the elders?' 'I said to thy disciples that they should cast it out'; Mk. ii 18, vii 5, ix 18. It is that of Jesus himself: 'Where is the guest-chamber where I may eat the passover with my disciples?' (Mk. xiv 14 and parallels): 'he cannot be my disciple,' Lk. xiv 26. But it is also the phraseology of the earliest stratum of the evangelic narrative. Mark writes οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ some thirty-two times out of about forty: Luke has οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ rather oftener than οἱ μαθηταί, of which the first independent occurrence is Lk. ix 18: Matthew too, though his divergence from Marcan usage is much greater, uses οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ consistently until Matt. xiii 10: and even in the latest of the Gospels οἱ μαθηταί without αὐτοῦ is not found in St John till xi 7. That is to say, at one end of the evangelic tradition St Mark's Gospel distinguishes itself by its close adherence to the archaic phrase, at the other St Matthew's is the only Gospel where οἱ μαθηταί without αὐτοῦ becomes preponderant, especially in the nominative (Matt. xiii 10, xiv 15 19 (*bis*) 22, xv 12 33 36 (*bis*), xvi 5, xvii 6 10 13 19, xviii 1, xix 10 13 25, xxi 6 20, xxiv 3, xxvi 8 17 35 56).

It may be worth while just to examine the few exceptions in St Mark, for some of them are not really exceptions at all.

iv 34 κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα. Here obviously ἰδίοις takes the place of αὐτοῦ.

vi 41 ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς. In the middle of the story of the Feeding

[1] Ναζωραῖος is the only form known to Matthew, John, and Acts: Ναζαρηνός the only form in Mark: Luke in his Gospel uses Ναζαρηνός iv 34 (= Mk. i 24), Ναζωραῖος xviii 37 (= Ναζαρηνός Mark x 47), while in xxiv 19 the authorities are divided between the two forms. As we know, Ναζαρηνός Nazarenus was the form which established itself in Greek and Latin usage. It looks as though Ναζωραῖος was the word used in the early period in Jewish circles, in place of which Mark, writing for Roman and Gentile readers, substituted the form intelligible to them.

[2] It is hardly credible that Matthew can have made the Jews say (xxvii 64) to Pilate 'lest *the* disciples come and steal him away', in spite of ℵ B (unsupported indeed here by any other authorities), Tischendorf and W-H text, though not their margin; and we must certainly read with all other witnesses οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

of the Five Thousand, the full phrase occurring just before, vi 35, and just after, vi 45.

viii 1 προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητάς. Add probably αὐτοῦ with A B W Θ sah syr-sin (African Latin is defective).

ix 14 ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς. Here the omission of αὐτοῦ is really natural, because three of the apostles were already with our Lord.

x 10, 13 are certainly exceptions to the ordinary usage. Like the other evangelists, Mark it would seem tired of the repetition of αὐτοῦ. Perhaps we may also take into account the consideration that οἱ μαθηταί at this point of the Gospel has become simply equivalent to 'the Twelve': Mark would never have written, like Luke at the Entry into Jerusalem (xix 37), ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν.

x 24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταί may simply take up τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ of verse 23: but some good authorities actually add αὐτοῦ, D Θ 1 Old Latins (including k).

xiv 16 ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἦλθον. Not 'the disciples' generally, but the two particular disciples who had been commissioned for the purpose.

v. '*The crowd*', *or* '*the Multitudes*'.

ὄχλος (ὄχλοι) is found thirty-seven times in Mark, forty-eight times in Matthew, thirty-nine times in Luke. Allowing for the relative lengths of the three Gospels, the preponderance is clearly with Mark. Thus in the story of Jairus's daughter he uses ὄχλος five times (v 21–31): 'a big crowd gathered', 'a big crowd followed', the woman 'came in the crowd', Jesus 'turned about in the crowd', the disciples remonstrate 'You see the crowd, and yet . . .' Luke reduces the five occasions to three, Matthew (whose compression of the whole episode is unusual even for him) has the word only once.

In Mark the noun is with one exception used in the singular: the crowd is visualized as one, and an ascending scale of adjectives πολύς, ἱκανός, πλεῖστος, defines on occasion its size. The single exception, x 1 συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι, perhaps emphasizes the numbers who collected from different directions on the journey through Peraea, where our Lord was known by report but not personally. Matthew, on the other hand, prefers the vaguer and more general plural (thirty-one plural to seventeen singular): Luke uses both indifferently.

Of Mark's adjectives πολύς is of course the commonest, 'a big crowd' (v 21, 24, vi 34, viii 1, ix 14). Matthew, too, has both ὄχλος πολύς and, more commonly, ὄχλοι πολλοί. Luke like Mark prefers the singular, having ὄχλοι πολλοί only with a συν-verb (v 15 συνήρχοντο, xiv 25 [= apparently Mk. x 1] συνεπορεύοντο).

Mark has once ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος, xii 37, where the rendering 'the common people heard him gladly' (A.V.) is probably just what Mark meant.[1]

πλεῖστος ὄχλος once, iv 1, with ℵ B C L Δ: Matthew once (xxi 8) ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος.

ὄχλος ἱκανός once, x 46. It is a favourite epithet with Luke, and he employs it with ὄχλος Lk. vii 12, Acts xi 24, 26, xix 26.

πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ii 13, iv 1, ix 15, xi 18. Matt. xiii 2 (= Mk. iv 1), Lk. vi 19, xiii 17. Note the idiom by which this phrase governs a plural verb, Mk. iv 1 ἦσαν ℵ B C L Δ Θ 33 d, ix 15 ἰδόντες ἐξεθάμβησαν ℵ B C D L W Δ (Θ ἰδὼν ἐξεθάμβησαν) *fam.* 1 and *fam.* 13, 28, 33, a b c d ff i[2] sah syr-sin, xi 18 ἐξεπλήσσοντο ℵ Δ c sah syr-sin, Lk. vi 19 ℵ B L W b e (l) vulg. sah: i. e. Mark 2 (3) out of 4, Luke 1 out of 2.

For other instances of the same idiom see iii 7, 8 καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος . . .[3] πλῆθος πολύ, ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει, ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν: and perhaps xv 1 where I suspect that a stop should be put after γραμματέων, and a fresh clause begin καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν.

Luke can use ὄχλος or πλῆθος of disciples (Lk. vi 17, xix 37): Mark never does. 'Disciples' are always to Mark a limited company.

vi. *The word* 'to follow', ἀκολουθεῖν.

Ἀκολουθεῖν has of course in all the Gospels the possibility of a metaphorical or spiritual sense, in which the literal sense tends almost to be forgotten. Instances in St Mark are the call of the apostles Simon and Andrew i 18, the call of the rich young man x 21, the summons of Jesus to all who would 'follow him' that they should take up the cross viii 34, the profession of St Peter that he and his fellow-apostles had 'left all and followed him' x 28.

But the notable points about the 'Marcan usage' of ἀκολουθεῖν appear to be (i) that the literal sense is in some passages obviously the only one; (ii) that it is not obscurely present in the background in the instances of the metaphorical use—'to follow about'; (iii) that,

[1] L.S quote ὁ λεὼς ὁ πολύς from Lucian *Rhet. Praec.* 17.

[2] Vulg. codd. opt. (A ℈* F H* Y St Gall) 'stupefactus est expauerunt'. That is to say, either St Jerome had not made up his mind between the two alternatives, or more probably he meant to correct the O. L. expauerunt into the singular stupefactus est, and his amanuensis failed to make his intention clear.

[3] ἠκολούθησεν (-αν) in the editions is I think an insertion from Matthew iv 25 (xii 15): see immediately below, p. 239. But even if it is genuine, some of the oldest authorities who give the word (ℵ C, followed by Tischendorf) give it in the plural. Luke, who is fond of πλῆθος, rarely uses the plural with it (Lk. xix 37), though on two occasions he appears to combine plural and singular, Lk. xxiii 1 καὶ ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πειλᾶτον, Acts xxi 36 ἠκολούθει τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ κράζοντες.

with one possible exception in the earlier half of the Gospel, it is not used in narrative of or to the apostles, who did not 'follow' but rather accompanied their Master.

(i) In v 24 'a big crowd followed' Jesus: ollowed in the literal sense, and when the woman came in the crowd and touched him, she was behind, ὄπισθεν. In xi 9 part of the crowd 'goes in front', the other part 'follows behind', οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες. In xiv 54 Peter 'followed a long way behind' to the high priest's residence. The verb is once used of the apostles on the journey to Jerusalem, x 32, and there anything but a literal meaning is excluded. Jesus went on ahead, the disciples 'followed' at a distance, and then he took them up again into his company: ἦσαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ . . . καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο· καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα . . . That is to say, their normal position was at his side, he in the midst of them: it was exceptional that they should be behind him.

(ii) Even in the metaphorical use of 'following' Christ as his disciple, the literal sense is often, in St Mark, not far off. When Simon and Andrew are called to 'follow' in i 18, the parallel phrase in i 20 of James and John is ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. If in viii 34 ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν (C* D W Θ a b i, against ℵ B c k syr-sin ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν with Matthew) is taken as the true text, Mark preserves an indication of the literal meaning in ὀπίσω μου. When Bartimaeus was healed of his blindness at the gates of Jericho, x 52, a similar touch of the literal sense is given in the addition 'on the road', ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, a touch omitted by both Matthew and Luke. Negatively it is most instructive to note that Mark never uses ἀκολουθέω in the intermediate sense of the crowds 'following' Jesus, more or less as his disciples: for in iii 7 the word ἠκολούθησεν (or ἠκολούθησαν or ἠκολούθουν—the very variations in form, and in the position of the word in the verse, are suspicious) is derived from Matt. iv 25 (xii 15) and is omitted by D 28 124 Old Latins and syr-sin. It was borrowed to ease the construction of the lengthy sentence. On the other hand, Matthew regularly uses ἀκολουθεῖν of the multitudes, iv 25, viii 1, (xii 15), xiv 13, xix 2, xx 29; Luke preserves something of the literal sense, vii 9, ix 11, xxiii 29.

(iii) As has been said above, Mark avoids the word ἀκολουθεῖν in relation to the apostolic company throughout the latter part of the Gospel: the disciples who were with Jesus were by that time not merely his followers but his companions and friends. Ἀκολουθεῖν is in fact only used twice of the disciples: in ii 15, on the first mention of μαθηταί, we are told that they were now many, and that they were beginning to 'follow him about', ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί, καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ; and in vi 1

Jesus ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ —though I do not feel sure that we should not rather here interpret literally, in the sense that they 'followed' at an interval. However that may be, certain it is that in the Gospel as a whole the disciples and their Master are treated as a unit much more definitely than in the other two Synoptists. Mk. iv 36 illustrates this in comparison with Matthew, Mk. ix 38 in comparison with Luke.

In iv 36 it is the disciples who leave (or dismiss) the crowd and take up Jesus into their boat, ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν (the same verb as in x 33, 'take into company with them') ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. Matthew on the other hand makes Jesus himself dismiss the multitudes, xiii 36 ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους,[1] and the disciples follow him into the boat, viii 23 ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. And in ix 38 Mark writes that John said 'Master, we saw a man who does not follow us casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he does not follow us'[2]: but Luke (ix 49) does not like this identification of the 'following' of the disciples with the 'following' of Jesus, and substitutes μεθ' ἡμῶν 'follow with us'. Similar, though in itself less significant, is the change from Mk. xiv 26 ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον into Lk. xxii 39 ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη . . . ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί.

Note finally in illustration of St Mark's consistent use of ἀκολουθεῖν that, though it is never used of the apostles (or at any rate never after vi 1), it is used of the holy women in xv 41. While all the apostles 'left him and fled' (xiv 50), there were women watching the Crucifixion from afar, who 'when he was in Galilee used to follow him about and minister to him'. Their 'following' belonged, that is, to the Galilean period of the Ministry: they had not been in his company on the long circuitous journey up to Jerusalem: but they had doubtless come up to the feast in the hope or expectation of seeing him again.

[1] Though Huck in his *Synopsis* does not so print it, it is clear that, as Matt. xiii 34, 35 depends on Mk. iv 33, 34, so this opening phrase of Matt. xiii 36 depends on the opening phrase of Mk. iv 36.

[2] The variations of reading in this verse are puzzling (though in itself the repetition of the words οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν is quite after Marcan usage), but they do not affect the substantial point, which is that Mark writes 'follows *us*'. That is certain, in spite of the defection of D a k sah.

C. H. TURNER.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JULY, 1925

NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

VI. *The use of numbers in St Mark's Gospel.*

It is my firm conviction that the Mark which lay before the later Synoptists, St Matthew and St Luke, was no other than the Mark which we possess. Abstraction has indeed to be made of *various readings* which in the natural course of transmission by scribes may have crept into the text of Mark between its original publication and the particular copies which, ten or twenty years later, lay before the other two evangelists: or again it is conceivable (though not very probable) that the true reading of Mark might in individual cases survive only in Matthew, or in Luke, or in Matthew and Luke, and have been lost in all the direct tradition of manuscripts and versions. But various readings are one thing, recensions are another. And the evidence for an *Ur-Marcus*—that is to say, for an original Mark of which the Gospel we have is a *recension* or new edition—crumbles on examination into nothing.

In the book which is the starting-point of all detailed criticism of the Synoptic problem, Sir John Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae* (ed. 2 p. 152) this conclusion is nearly but not quite reached. 'The Petrine source used by the two later Synoptists was not an *Ur-Marcus*, but St Mark's Gospel almost as we have it now. Almost; but not quite. For instance, a later editor's hand is very probably to be seen in . . .' and Sir John proceeds to enumerate nine passages. Now of these nine, three are cases of large numbers, 2,000 (v 13), 200 (vi 37), 300 (xiv 5), all three omitted by both Matthew and Luke, two of them found in St John:

and it seems to be suggested that these two may owe their place in our present Mark to the influence of the 'Johannine tradition'.[1]

Therefore it may be useful, so far as these three passages are concerned, to lay the ghost once for all, and to shew that it is Marcan usage to note numbers, and Matthaean and Lucan usage to tend to omit them. As we should expect, there is no universal rule to be laid down: sometimes both the two later evangelists retain the detail, but sometimes one omits, sometimes the other, and sometimes both. It is entirely in line with what happens in similar cases that there should be a proportion of instances in which their observed habit of omission of numbers should lead both to omit on the same occasion.

That Mark is fond of numerals is then a matter of fact which this instalment of my Notes is intended to prove: and if it is proved, the presumption is that the three doubtful or disputed numbers are genuine also.[2] But that is only one side of the argument. The other side is that the natural tendency of an educated writer of ancient times would be to omit numbers. For that assertion I am glad to be able to base myself on the testimony of Père Hippolyte Delèhaye, written down without any reference to the Gospels but therefore the more impartial (I have quoted it once in print, but it will bear quoting again): 'Les procédés de la rhétorique des anciens les amenaient à ne point multiplier les noms de personnes et de lieux, à éviter de donner des chiffres exacts'.[3] Persons, places, numbers: Mark is no rhetorician and is full of all three, Matthew and Luke are in nearer touch with the literary habits and presuppositions of their time, and tend, irregularly no doubt and so in a sense capriciously, to improve on their exemplar by omitting them.

There are certain numbers which refer to significant periods or events of our Lord's life, and these naturally recur in the other Synoptic Gospels:

1. Mark i 13 the 'forty days' of the Temptation: Luke iv 1, 2, Matt.

[1] I should reverse the argument, and see here proof of the dependence of the Fourth Gospel upon the Second: the numbers are not the only points of contact, and on Sir John's argument *ἀγοράσωμεν* and *φαγεῖν* (vi 37 = Jo. vi 5), *ἀνέπεσαν* and *ἄνδρες* (vi 40, 44 = Jo. vi 10) ought all to have come into Mark from the 'Johannine tradition'. It must always be borne in mind that for fifty years after its composition St Mark's Gospel was the standard source of the evangelic history. Not only Matthew and Luke, but John and Pseudo-Peter as well, depend on him.

[2] I venture here to cite the final sentence of a letter from Sir John Hawkins to myself (under date June 1, 1920): 'What you say about Mark's *constant* fondness for numerals is a weighty argument for the genuineness of the 200 and 300 and 2,000 about which I was doubtful'.

[3] *Saint Martin et Sulpice Sévère* p. 82 (*Analecta Bollandiana* vol. xxxviii, 1920).

iv 2 (Matthew, however, makes it 'forty days and forty nights' of fasting).

2. Mark viii 31, ix 31, x 34, the prophecies of the Resurrection 'after three days': Matthew and Luke, however (with the Creed-form of St Paul 1 Cor. xv 4), prefer the phrase 'on the third day', Matt. xvi 21, xvii 23, xx 19, Luke ix 22 (in ix 44, parallel to Mark ix 31, he omits all details), xviii 33; just as the printed texts make them, save in Luke xviii 33, prefer ἐγερθῆναι (ἐγερθήσεται) to Mark's ἀναστῆναι (ἀναστήσεται).[1]

3. Mark ix 5, the 'three tabernacles' of the Transfiguration, is repeated in Matt. xvii 4, Luke ix 33.

There are also certain numbers which enhance the wonder of the miracles wrought by Christ, and, probably for that reason, are retained by Matthew and Luke:

4. Mark v 25 the woman who had had 'an issue of blood twelve years': repeated in Matt. ix 20, Luke viii 43.

5. Mark vi 38, 41, 43, 44: viii 2, 5, 6, 8, 9: viii 19, 20. The two accounts of the feeding of the multitude, and the summary reference to them by Christ, are incorporated by Matthew without the omission of any of the numbers which point either to the size of the multitudes (five thousand; four thousand), their long fast on the second occasion (three days), the small amount of provision (five loaves and two fishes; seven loaves and a few tiny fishes) and the large amount that remained over (twelve κόφινοι; seven σπυρίδες): indeed he adds on each occasion that the numbers of the multitude exclude 'women and children'.[2] Luke of course has only the first account of feeding: but there he, like Matthew, repeats the five loaves and two fishes, the twelve basketsful, and the five thousand 'men'.

6. The references to 'the Twelve', common in St Mark (iii 14, [15], iv 10, vi 7, ix 35, x 32, xi 11, xiv 10, 17, 20, 43), are rarer in Matthew and Luke, and form a transitional use to their treatment of other numbers given in St Mark. As I discussed this point fully in the last instalment of Notes on Marcan usage (*J. T. S.* April 1925, xiv 232, 233), no more need be said here than that Matthew never says οἱ δώδεκα but only εἷς τῶν δώδεκα (twice), οὗτοι οἱ δώδεκα (once), οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί (four times), οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι (once), while Luke has οἱ δώδεκα five times, οἱ ἀπόστολοι four times—in Luke ix 1 it is not certain whether we should read 'the Twelve' or 'the twelve apostles'. In any case 'the Twelve' is characteristically Marcan.

---

[1] B in Matthew 2/3 gives ἀναστήσεται. And D latt. in Matt. 2/3 give or represent μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας.

[2] Presumably because Mark vi 44 (cf. Jo. vi 10) speaks of πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. In Matt. xvi 9, 10 the precise numbers of the κόφινοι and σφυρίδες are omitted.

From this point onwards I record Mark's mention of figures in the order in which they are found in his Gospel, including two instances (8, **28**: iv 4–8, xiii 35) which illustrate his passion for precision though no actual figures are given.

7. ii 3 *παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.* Omitted by both Matthew and Luke, who doubtless considered that it was sufficient to say that the paralytic was brought 'on a bed'.

8. iv 4–8 *ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν . . . καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες . . . καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας . . . καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν . . . καὶ ἔφερεν εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν.* Mark, that is, is careful to make a parallelism between three classes of seed that did not germinate at all, and three that did—that is the meaning of the change from singular to plural—producing respectively thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and a hundredfold. Both Matthew and Luke miss the parallelism, and the one gives the plural all through, the other the singular, so that in both the implication is that only one class out of four came to any good, an implication that is definitely absent from St Mark's account.

9. iv 8, 20 *εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν . . . ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν.*[1] Matt. xiii 8, 23, retains the numbers on both occasions, though on both he inverts their order, 'a hundred', 'sixty', 'thirty': Luke drops all distinction between the three numbers, giving in the parable only 'a hundredfold' and no number at all in the interpretation, viii 8, 15.

10. v 11, 13 *ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη . . . ὡς δισχίλιοι,* 'a great herd of swine . . . about two thousand'. The number disappears from both the other accounts, Matthew being content with *ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν*, Luke similarly with *ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν.* Probably both of them—Luke at any rate—felt that the figure might be thought exaggerated. In fact all Mark's larger cyphers are dropped (apart from those of the miracles of Feeding, see **5** above), such as the 200 *δηνάρια* of **14**, vi 37, or the 300 of **30**, xiv 5, and it is only the smaller ones that have a chance of surviving.

11. v 42 *ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα*, of the daughter of Jaeirus. Luke retains the note, but transfers it to the beginning of the story (viii 42), adding that she was an only daughter, *θυγάτηρ μονογενής.* Matthew, who reduces the whole episode, like the preceding episode of the demoniac, to the smallest possible compass, omits.

12. vi 7 *ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο.* Both Matthew and Luke omit the 'two and two': Luke, however, has an equivalent statement in his record of the Mission of the Seventy (or Seventy-two) x 1 *ἀπέστειλεν*

[1] On the reading and interpretation of *εις, εν* in these verses, see *J. T. S.* Oct. 1924, xxvi 16.

αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο, and it might be thought that he has simply transferred it from the one place to the other. But it would seem that it was our Lord's constant habit to send his disciples in pairs: see 22 (xi 1) and 31 (xiv 13) below, and compare the lists of the Twelve in Matt. x 2, Acts i 13. The balance of probability suggests therefore that Luke derived his ἀνὰ δύο of the Seventy from his special source at that place: there are other instances where he suppresses in what he borrows from Mark features which he retains in non-Marcan portions of his Gospel. If Dr Streeter is right in his thesis that Luke came across Mark's Gospel when he had already composed the first draft of his own, it is not really surprising that in order to provide room for the new material he had to make excisions on a rather drastic scale. One may go further and conjecture that, just because Mark's non-literary Greek offered so many stumbling-blocks to his sense of style, he treated it throughout in a more ruthless temper and altered things that in a source presenting fewer solecisms he might have let pass.

13. vi 9 μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτῶνας. The detail goes to heighten the ascetic character impressed by our Lord on the preparations for the Missionary journey of the Twelve: and Matthew and Luke, who emphasize this aspect to a still further point than Mark—they agree, according to the critical texts, in refusing the staff which Mark allows [1] —naturally repeat it.

14. vi 37 ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους; 'Are we to go and spend ten pounds on bread for them?' The naive question of the disciples seemed a reflexion on their faith, and the whole clause disappears in both Matthew and Luke. But the Fourth Evangelist (Jo. vi 7) took it over from Mark, turning it into a statement of fact 'Ten pounds' worth of loaves would not be enough', and putting it into the mouth of Philip. Compare the case of the three hundred δηνάρια, 30 below.

15. vi 40 κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα. Matthew omits entirely: Luke characteristically omits the higher number and contents himself (ix 14) with ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. It is curious that in the story of Obadiah's hiding the prophets 'by fifties' in the cave, 3 Reg. xviii 4, 13, verse 4 gives the κατὰ πεντήκοντα of Mark, verse 13 the ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα of Luke.

16. vi 48 περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτός. Matthew keeps the phrase: Lucan parallels fail us till chapter ix of Mark, but see below on no. 28.

17. viii 14 εἰ μὴ ἕνα ἄρτον. 'They had forgotten to bring loaves, and had not more than one loaf with them in the boat.' As so often in the

[1] There is some authority in both Matt. x 10 and Luke ix 3 for ῥάβδους in place of ῥάβδον. In Luke it is quite inadequate: but in Matthew it includes C L W Δ a k and may possibly be right.

case of Mark's dittographies, Matthew is content with one half of the double phrase, and omits the 'one loaf'.

18. ix 2 μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ, 'five days after' [i. e. after the Great Confession of viii 29] 'Jesus takes with him Peter and James and John'. Matthew retains the precise date: Luke ix 28 turns it into a round number, 'about a week', ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ.

19. ix 43, 45 τὰς δύο χεῖρας . . . τοὺς δύο πόδας. There is no parallel in Luke: in Matthew's abbreviated account (xviii 8) the numerals remain, the articles disappear; Mark's phrase, however, is good Greek for 'your two hands', 'your two feet'.

20. x 30 ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ. To the other two Synoptists the phrase had a touch of exaggeration about it, and Matthew (xix 29) reduces it to πολλαπλασίονα, Luke (xviii 30) to ἑπταπλασίονα.[1]

21. x 35, 41 οἱ δύο . . . οἱ δέκα. The reading οἱ δύο is only given by B C 579 and the Egyptian versions: but it is in accordance with 'Marcan usage', and οἱ δύο . . . οἱ δέκα, 'the two . . . the ten', mutually support one another. There is no Lucan parallel: Matthew has 'the ten', but has only 'the sons of Zebedee' without 'two'.

22. xi 1 ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. So Matthew and Luke: but contrast Matthew in no. 31. As I have suggested on no. 12 above, it seems to have been our Lord's regular custom to send out his disciples in pairs.

23. xii 20, 21 ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα . . . καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν . . . καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα. The numerals are an integral element of the point of the problem put to our Lord, and so both the other accounts retain them all.

[24]. xii 42 μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλεν . . . Matthew omits the episode: Luke substitutes τινὰ χήραν πενιχράν. I have put this instance in brackets, because Luke clearly regarded μία not as the numeral but as in effect the indefinite article: and in this I believe he interpreted Mark correctly. Mark's style is so naive that it is not probable that he meant to emphasize any contrast between πολλοὶ πλούσιοι and μία πτωχή, any more than between μία χήρα and λεπτὰ δύο. There were 'plenty of rich people', and then there was 'a poor widow'. Mark is fond of εἷς (generally with a following genitive[2]), and Luke almost invariably

[1] I follow Burkitt (*Gospel History and its Transmission* p. 50) in reading 'sevenfold' in Luke with D Old Latins (including St Cyprian and Jovinian) and perhaps the Diatessaron. St Jerome *adv. Jovin.* ii 19, 26 asserted that Jovinian, for reading *septies*, 'aut falsarii aut imperitiae reum teneri': the question now is whether the tables should not be turned.

[2] In two or three cases Mark has εἷς ἐκ, ix 17 εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου, xiv 18 εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν, and according to some authorities in xiv 20 εἷς [ἐκ] τῶν δώδεκα. I think this

changes it to τις. Just as in late Latin and in the Romance languages, so in Greek also (in the κοινή and in modern Greek), the place of an indefinite article came gradually to be supplied by the numeral 'one'.

25. xii 42 ἔβαλεν λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης. Luke xxi 2 keeps the 'two mites' (omitting Mark's parenthetical explanation for his Roman readers, 'which are a farthing'), because the story turns on it.

[**26**]. xiii 2 καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν. A 'Western' reading of D W and O. L., depending on xiv 58 xv 29: hardly genuine, or why should both Matthew and Luke have omitted it?

27. xiii 27 ἐπισυνάξει . . . ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων. The 'four winds' are simply a variation of the proverbial 'four quarters' of the earth, north, south, east and west. The phrase is taken from Zach. ii 6 (10) and is copied by Matthew xxiv 31: Luke omits the whole verse.

28. xiii 35 ἢ ὀψὲ ἢ μεσονύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ πρωί. A popular way of representing the four watches (cf. 'the fourth watch', no. **16** above), into which Roman usage divided the twelve hours of the night, so as to secure that no guard should be on watch for more than three hours: Vegetius *de re militari* p. 83, quoted by Blass (I owe the ref. to Swete *ad loc.*) on Acts xii 4. Matthew omits the details: when Luke writes (xii 38) 'whether in the second or in the third watch', he may be meaning to suggest the two central watches, i. e. the darkest hours, or he may be reproducing the Jewish terminology of three watches, the second being φυλακὴ μέση (Judges vii 19), the third φυλακὴ πρωία (Ps. cxxix [cxxx] 6).

29. xiv 1 ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας. Matthew retains the phrase: Luke paraphrases with ἤγγιζεν. If μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας means—see Field's admirable note on Matt. xvi 21—nothing else than τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, i. e. as we should say 'after two days', it follows that μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας must be equivalent to τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ (if that phrase were used), and mean 'next day'. The only exact parallel appears to be Hosea vi 2 ὑγιάσει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, ἐν τῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἐξαναστησόμεθα (quoted by Tertullian *adv. Marcionem* iv 43); for if, as Field assumes, the healing and the rising up refer to successive days, μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας must there again mean 'next day'. I do not feel entirely clear about this: but there is no real doubt as to the day of the week which Mark intends in this passage to identify. For in verse 12 the day before the Crucifixion, that is the Thursday, is called 'the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover': by Roman reckoning the lambs were slain on the same day that they were eaten, and on that day the leavened bread would be cleared away and

is one of Mark's latinisms: and as *unus ex* (*de*) is the only possible rendering in Latin of εἷς with a following genitive, it is futile of editors to cite the Latins, where ἐκ is doubtful in the Greek.

unleavened bread substituted, and it is Roman reckoning which Mark follows—by Jewish reckoning the lambs were slain on the afternoon of the 13th Nisan, and, a new day beginning at sunset, they were eaten on the evening of the 14th. But if the events of Thursday commence with xiv 12, then xiv 1–11 are the events of Wednesday at latest. But of Wednesday too at earliest, if tradition following the Fourth Gospel rightly places the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday: for xi 12 refers then to the morning of Monday, and xi 20 to the morning of Tuesday. The new day of xiv 1 can therefore only be Wednesday.

30. xiv 5 ἠδύνατο τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων. The figure was large, £12 or so, and no doubt seemed exaggerated: Matthew omits it, and there is nothing to correspond to it in Luke's account of an anointing (vii 36–50). But the Fourth Gospel (Jo. xii 5) —just as with the 200 δηνάρια at the Feeding of the multitude, no. **14** above—follows Mark and retains it.

31. xiv 13 ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. Mark once more notes (see nos. **12** and **22** above) that disciples were sent in pairs: Matthew, as in no. **12**, omits, Luke xxii 8, presumably from independent knowledge, inserts the names, Peter and John.

[**32**]. xiv 20 ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ ἓν τρύβλιον. So B C* ? Θ 565: the rest omit εν, and I think it may represent a marginal variant ἐν for εἰς (from Matthew xxvi 23 ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ). Therefore I have put it within brackets, for in that case it has no bearing on our problem, not being a numeral. But if ἓν is right, Matthew omits it: Luke has nothing strictly parallel.

33. xiv 30, 68, 72*a*, 72*b* (the two cock-crowings and three denials) σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ . . . καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον [καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν] . . . καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν· καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα . . . ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα δὶς φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Admittedly all three Synoptists record a triple denial: admittedly Mark, and Mark only, speaks of a second cock-crowing. But so strong was the reciprocal influence exerted by the later accounts on the text of Mark that not many authorities in St Mark other than the Syrian recension (the *Textus Receptus*) give all four references to the second crowing, and one first class authority, ℵ (with 579 and c) omits it on all four occasions. (1) Verse 30: *om* δίς ℵ C* D W 579 a c ff i k arm aeth. (2) verse 68: *om* καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν ℵ B L W Ψ* 579 c syr-sin sah. (3) verse 72*a*: *om* ἐκ δευτέρου ℵ L 579 c. (4) verse 72*b*: *om* δίς ℵ C* W Δ Σ 579 c aeth. Our best authorities (B D the chief Old Latins syr-sin sah) all give three out of the four references: but they differ as to the one they omit, for B syr-sin sah have the first, third, and fourth, D and the Old Latins give the second, third, and fourth. Thus the third and fourth references are

above cavil: the first is implied by the fourth, and it is further an observed rule[1] that scribes are more prone to the influence of their prejudices—in this case to the influence of the parallel accounts—on a first occasion, but defer to the authority of their exemplar if the reading they have tampered with recurs once again or oftener: only about the second can there be any doubt. Here ℵ B omit, and Westcott and Hort do not even give καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν a place in the margin. Tischendorf, against ℵ B, puts the words in the text, and I am sure he is right. The evidence of ℵ L W 579 c—five witnesses for omission out of the nine—is nearly worthless, since they omit on one or more of the other occasions: the documents of the Sahidic version are divided, see Horner *ad loc.*: so that B Ψ* syr-sin are the only unimpeachable authorities for omission. But it must not be forgotten that the influence of the parallel accounts, in the case of a complete statement like καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν, which could be simply dropped without apparent injury to the context, would be powerful for omission. And if ever internal evidence is allowed the decisive word, it guarantees (as I think) the genuineness of the phrase in dispute. I cannot believe that any other than the Evangelist put in the dramatic touch which is needed for the developement of the story.

34. xiv 41 καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον. Mark does not mention that our Lord went away and prayed a third time, though of course he implies it; but because his story is told, here as elsewhere, from the point of view of the disciples' experience he does mention his third coming to the disciples. Matthew xxvi 44 fills up what Mark implies, and transfers 'the third time' to Christ's prayer. Luke omits the repeated coming and going, and concentrates the whole story into one withdrawal and one return.

35. xiv 58 ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω, and xv 29 Οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν [ἐν] τρισὶν ἡμέραις (cf. xiii 2, no. **26** above, if the reading were genuine). Matthew retains, both at the Trial and at the Crucifixion, doubtless because of the reference to the Resurrection: Luke omits the whole episode of the 'false witness'.

36. xv 1, 25, 33, 34 πρωὶ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες . . . ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν . . . καὶ γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης. καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. Only Mark enumerates the synchronisms of all the four watches of Good Friday: both Matthew and Luke omit the notice of the third hour.[2]

[1] See Wordsworth in the *Epilogus* to the Vulgate Gospels, p. 727 'saepe enim scribae quod primo loco pro mendo habebant, secundo pro uero agnoscunt'.

[2] The Fourth Gospel has ἦν δὲ πρωί xviii 28, ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη xix 14, but I forbear to discuss the difficulty here.

Of these thirty cases (nos. **7** to **36**) I put aside three, nos. **24 26** and **32**: there remain twenty-seven. Three times only out of this total, **13**, **22**, **23**, do both Matthew and Luke retain the numbers; but in order to be scrupulously fair I add on the same side the three occasions on which Matthew retains when there is no Lucan parallel, **16 19 27**, and the one occasion where Luke retains when there is no Matthaean parallel, **25**. Against these we have to set seven passages where both omit numbers, **7** (**8**) **10 12 14 33 36**, and one where both bring the number down, **20**, as well as three passages where Matthew omits but there is no parallel in Luke, **17 21 30**. In the nine remaining instances one or other of the later Synoptists fails to reproduce the precision of Mark: in four, **11 15 28 31**, Matthew omits while Luke retains, in four more, **9 29 34 35**, Luke omits while Matthew retains, and in one, **18**, Luke changes a precise number to a round one.

That is to say, it is more common for both of them to omit than for both of them to retain a number given in Mark: and it is vastly more common (about three times in four) for one or other of them to omit a number than for both of them to retain it.

This clear and decisive result (as I think it) tallies with a feature noticed in the last section of the Notes on Marcan Usage (*J.T.S.* April 1925, xxvi 237), namely the ascending scale of adjectives with which Mark is careful on different occasions to estimate the size of the crowd.

As the result of our enquiry, it is not too much to say that the suggestion that some of the numbers in Mark are not original because both Matthew and Luke omit them cannot maintain itself in face of the argument from Marcan usage. One more nail has been driven into the coffin of that old acquaintance of our youth, *Ur-Marcus*. He did enough harm in his time, but he is dead and gone: let no attempts be made to disinter his skeleton.

C. H. TURNER.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

VII. *Particles*: (1) Ὅτι *interrogative*.

1. ii 7 διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν Ὅτι οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ.

Matthew gives simply οὗτος βλασφημεῖ, and so probably read ὅτι in Mark, understanding it as = 'that'. So B Θ and W-H margin: τί the rest.

2. ii 16 ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;

τί ὅτι A C Δ etc., διὰ τί ℵ D W with Matthew and Luke. Both these readings are obvious attempts to get rid of the difficulty of ὅτι interrogative. The modern editors give ὅτι.

3. viii 12 καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει Ὅτι ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον;

So C, and Origen *Selecta in Ezech.* xiv 20[1] (Delarue iii 429) ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ Ὅτι ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ; The rest have τί. Matthew and Luke both make it a statement, not a question, and if they drew on Mark must have read ὅτι: but if, as is probable, they drew here from Q, no argument of course can be drawn from their phraseology.

4. ix 11 καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἠλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον;

The Ferrar group for ὅτι substitutes πῶς οὖν: the Ethiopic omits. The Old Latin MSS vary between *quare*, *quid*, *quia*, but all imply ὅτι. Matthew has τί οὖν;

5. ix 28 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;

Matthew has διὰ τί (Luke has no parallel), and διὰ τί is read in Mark by A D and others, while a few authorities have ὅτι διὰ τί and a few τί ὅτι. There can be no doubt that ὅτι is original in Mark.

Here are three certain cases of ὅτι as the direct interrogative, and two more probable ones—probable because in each case there are two good authorities in support, and the tendency to get rid of the construction was so obvious (neither Matthew nor Luke ever accepts it), and the change so easy, that I have no hesitation in accepting the evidence of B Θ and C Origen respectively on those two occasions.

I add two instances of what I take to be a similar employment of ὅτι as the *indirect* interrogative in Mark.

[1] In *Nouum Testamentum S. Irenaei* p. clxxiii (on Rom. iv 3) the reference is wrongly given as xv 20.

6. viii 16, 17 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν; καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;

I think this means 'they discussed with another why they had no loaves': after διαλογίζομαι we expect a reference to the question discussed. Matthew, who dislikes (as we have seen) ὅτι *interrogativum*, has to insert λέγοντες to make it ὅτι *recitativum*.

7. xiv 60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων Οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδὲν ὅτι οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;

Ὅτι is read by L W Ψ and (according to Buttmann's edition of B and Huck's *Synopsis*[1]) by B also. It is supported by the Latins a c ff k q Vulg., who make no break after οὐδέν but construct the whole of the high priest's words as one question and not two. In that case ὅτι can only be the indirect interrogative.

Now ὅτι as indirect interrogative can be supported by good classical authority, as Field shews (*Notes on the Translation of N. T.* p. 33) on Mark ix 11; and therefore the last two passages are only cited here to shew that the construction was familiar to, and used by, Mark. It is otherwise with the direct interrogative: and the Revised Version makes a bold attempt to get rid of it, in the three passages (**2**, **4**, **5** above) where external evidence compels us to read ὅτι, by translating ὅτι 'that'. It needs only to cite their renderings to shew their futility.[2]

2. ii 16 'The scribes of the Pharisees . . . said unto his disciples He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners'.

4. ix 11 'And they asked him, saying, The scribes say that Elijah must first come'.

5. ix 28 'His disciples asked him privately, *saying*, We could not cast it out'.

Of these three renderings in the text of R.V. (there is a relative return to sanity in the margin in each case) the first makes just tolerable sense, the other two are quite impossible, or in Field's language 'simply intolerable'. Classical prepossessions must be frankly thrown overboard when they lead us to such an *impasse*. Even if no authority could be found outside St Mark for the direct interrogative use of ὅτι, Field is certainly right that 'these two instances, occurring in the same chapter of St Mark, must be held mutually to support and sanction each other'. [Cf. A. T. Robertson *Grammar of the Greek N. T.* p. 729, J. H. Moulton *Prolegomena* p. 94 l. 3.]

[1] I have taken the opportunity to verify the point by reference to the photographic edition of cod. Vaticanus: the reading ὅτι is quite clear, and Tischendorf is wrong (how rarely, all things considered, that happens!) in omitting its testimony. W-H read τί in the text, ὅτι in the margin.

[2] It should be noted that all three passages are rightly punctuated as interrogative in Westcott and Hort.

But it is the main object of this instalment of my Notes to produce outside authority. The first of the following citations comes from Field.

LXX. 1 Chron. xvii 6 εἰ λαλῶν ἐλάλησα πρὸς μίαν φυλὴν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ποιμαίνειν τὸν λαόν μου λέγων Ὅτι οὐκ ᾠκοδομήκατέ μοι οἶκον κέδρινον; So both A.V. and R.V. 'Why . . .', so too Lagarde's Lucianic text, Διὰ τί . . . ; So Tischendorf's LXX: and it can only be considered another freak of judgement if the Cambridge small LXX text prints λέγων ὅτι Οὐκ . . .

1. *Hermas* Similitudes.

Of the four passages which follow the first two are from the printed texts, the last two depend on the testimony of the newly discovered papyrus (said to be of the third century) belonging to the University of Ann Arbor, Michigan. I am indebted to the generosity of Prof. Campbell Bonner of that University, who is in charge of the publication of the text, for my knowledge of the readings of this most important witness: in his article in the *Harvard Theological Review* for April 1925 he has himself called attention to the passage where the interrogative ὅτι is direct, *Sim.* VIII 6. 2.

Sim. II 10 μακάριοι οἱ . . . συνιέντες ὅτι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου πλουτίζονται. In the Palatine version 'felices qui . . . sentiunt quomodo a domino locupletantur': though the older 'vulgate' version mistranslates it 'sentiunt se locupletari'.

Sim. V 6. 4 ὅτι δὲ ὁ κύριος σύμβουλον ἔλαβε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους ἀγγέλους . . . ἄκουε: rightly rendered by both Latin versions 'quare autem dominus in consilio adhibuerit ('in consilium adhibuit' Pal.) filium honestosque nuntios . . . audi'.[1]

Sim. VIII 1. 4 (according to the new papyrus) ἀφὲς δέ, φησί, πάντα ἴδῃς, καὶ δηλωθήσεταί σοι ὅτι ἐστίν. Latin versions 'exspecta et [+ 'cum uniuersa uideris' Pal.] tunc demonstrabitur tibi quid significet'. Our other Greek authority, the late and bad Athos MS, has τὸ τί for ὅτι.

Sim. VIII 6. 2, according to the new papyrus, Ὅτι οὖν, φημί, κύριε, πάντες οὐ μετενόησαν; Latins 'Quare ergo, domine, [+ 'inquam' Pal.] non omnes egerunt paenitentiam?' The Athos MS has corrupted ὅτι into οὗτοι, doubtless because the scribe of the MS or its exemplar was puzzled by ὅτι *interrogativum*.

Hermas then in a corrected text comes to the support of St Mark, and the Latin translator understood him rightly. It might be a profitable topic to compare the Greek of Hermas with the Greek of Mark in some detail: on the present occasion it must suffice to call attention to the parallel between the συμπόσια συμπόσια of Mark vi 39 and the τάγματα τάγματα (supported by both the Athos MS and the new

[1] In the printed texts of the Vulgate version of Hermas the sentence is hopelessly confused and corrupt: I give the reading of the best MS, Bodl. Laud. misc. 488.

papyrus) of *Sim.* VIII 2. 8 ἦλθον τάγματα τάγματα, καὶ ἐπεδίδουν τὰς ῥάβδους τῷ ποιμένι. Shall we be told that 'the construction' in Hermas 'is Hebraistic'?

2. *Barnabas* Epistle.

To Tischendorf's note on Mark ii 16 I owe three references to Barnabas for the construction of ὅτι interrogative.

vii 9 προσέχετε· Τὸν μὲν ἕνα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, τὸν δὲ ἕνα ἐπικατάρατον. καὶ ὅτι τὸν ἐπικατάρατον ἐστεφανωμένον; ἐπειδὴ ὄψονται αὐτὸν . . . The editors do not mark a question: but the old Latin version has 'et quare is qui maledictus coronatus?'

viii 5 ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον; ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου. Latin 'quare ergo et lana in ligno est?'

x 1 ὅτι δὲ Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· Οὐ φάγεσθε χοῖρον . . .; τρία ἔλαβεν ἐν τῇ συνέσει δόγματα. Latin 'quare autem Moyses dicit . . .?'

Of these three passages only the second is quite certainly interrogative: but it establishes Barnabas' use of the construction, and the translator's witness is clear.

But Barnabas and Hermas are not the only early Christian authors whose translators were familiar with the construction of ὅτι interrogative, and indeed it has been introduced into contexts where it is probably or certainly alien to the intention of the original writer. The evidence to be cited is, however, valid as shewing that in the circles in which early translators moved—possibly we ought to paraphrase this as 'in early Roman Christian circles'—the construction belonged to the Greek with which they were familiar.

3. *The earliest Latin version of the Gospels.*

The earliest version known to us is that represented by *k* and St Cyprian. It emerges, that is to say, in Africa about A.D. 250: but it was doubtless half a century older than that, and it may well have been brought to Africa from Rome.

Matt. vii 13, 14 ap. Cypr. *Testimonia* iii 6 (Hartel I 119): 'De hoc ipso cata Mattheum Quid lata et spatiosa uia est quae ducit ad interitum . . . quid arta et angusta uia est quae ducit ad uitam?' The reading *quid* is guaranteed by the best manuscripts, V L P B R T U (Bodl. Laud. misc. 105, s. x ineunt.) X* (Rylands-Crawford MS s. viii). It corresponds to the Greek ὅτι πλατεῖα καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν, . . . ὅτι στενὴ καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωήν, and the only possible explanation is that the translator, however mistakenly, took the sentence as interrogative, and ὅτι as a particle of interrogation.[1]

4. *St Irenaeus* adv. hereses.

In two passages the Latin translator has used *quid* where the Greek

[1] I have no doubt that the reading of *k* 'quia data' is a corruption of 'quid lata'

had either certainly, as in the first of the two, or possibly, as in the second of the two, ὅτι. In the second passage, the Greek, whether τί or ὅτι, was intended to be interrogative; in the first the interrogation is a misrendering by the translator.

III xxxi [xxii] 2 'Nec dixisset *Quid tristis est anima mea?*' Matt. xxvi 38 (Ps. xli [xlii] 5). The Greek happens to be preserved in Theodoret's Dialogue Ἄτρεπτος: Οὐδ' ἂν εἰρήκει ὅτι περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου. There is no ὅτι in the text of St Matthew, but in the Psalm we have ἵνα τί περίλυπος ... and so the translator was led to render εἰρήκει ὅτι by 'said why' rather than by 'said that'. For though the Latin MSS are divided between *quid*, *quia*, *quod*, the best MS (C) has *quid*, and *quid* best explains the genesis of the other two, *quia* and *quod*: it must therefore be presumed that the Latin translator took Ὅτι περίλυπός ἐστιν; as a question, and ὅτι as the interrogative particle.

IV x 1 [v 3] 'Quid enim *credidit Abraham Deo et deputatum est ei ad iustitiam?* Primum quidem quoniam ipse est factor caeli et terrae, solus Deus: deinde autem quoniam faciet semen eius quasi stellas caeli'. Here St Irenaeus' meaning is clearly 'What was it that Abraham believed and it was counted to him for righteousness?' And the answer he gives appears to shew that he is thinking not of Rom. iv 3 at all (as the editors of Irenaeus followed by the *N. T. S. Irenaei* have assumed) but directly of Gen. xv 6, and that therefore the *Quid enim* that introduces the quotation has nothing to do with the τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; of Rom. iv 3. But the Armenian version of Irenaeus has, corresponding to *Quid enim*, 'And that'. Since we have found reason to think that the Latin translator was acquainted with the idiom ὅτι = 'why?', it is natural to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the two versions by supposing that Irenaeus wrote ὅτι ἐπίστευσεν and that one translator rendered 'what?', and the other 'that'. If so, as the sentence is certainly interrogative, St Irenaeus himself must have employed the interrogative ὅτι. But while I have no sort of doubt that Mark and Barnabas and Hermas and Latin translators of early Greek Christian writings used (or rendered) that construction, I should hesitate to place Irenaeus in the same category, and I think it more likely that the ὅτι which lay before the Armenian translator was a corruption of τί.

Ὅτι interrogative belongs to a different stratum of society, not to the writers of literary Greek, but to less cultivated Christian circles such as those which in the first and second centuries after Christ still talked Greek in the capital. Is it an accident that of the writings cited in this note Mark and Hermas certainly, in all probability the first translations of the Gospels and of Hermas, and possibly the translations of Barnabas and Irenaeus, were produced in the Church of Rome?

C. H. TURNER.

It is not improbable that the branch of the family which traced descent through Zerubbabel and the long line of kings of Judah was more exposed to the jealousy of the Hasmonaeans than the family of Nathan; and it may well be that they deemed it politic to settle outside Judaea. We have no certain *data* to go upon, and can only consider what would be likely to happen, the political circumstances being as they were. If, however, we may suppose—and there is no great improbability in the supposition—that in the first century after Christ there were living in Palestine *two* families claiming descent from David through Solomon and Nathan respectively, we have ready to hand a simple explanation of the discrepancy between the first and third Gospels in the lineage of Joseph. The first evangelist, or the source which he followed, assumed that Joseph was the heir of David through the Solomonic line; the third evangelist, who may be supposed to have had access to a genealogy of the descendants of David through Nathan, assumed, or was informed, that it was to this branch that Joseph belonged. This indeed is mere conjecture, but conjecture which takes account of whatever *data* are available need not be lightly set aside. Certainly in the Apostolic age more was known about the descendants of David than a casual reading of the Old Testament would lead us to expect. If 'the family of Nathan' remained in Judaea, it may perhaps have perished in the troubles of the siege of Jerusalem; and after A. D. 70 'the family of David' who traced descent through Solomon may well have been the sole surviving hope of those who still looked for the restoration of David's rule.

R. H. KENNETT.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

VII. *Particles* (*continued*)

(2) *Ὅτι recitative* (*after λέγειν or similar verbs*).

MUCH more common in St Mark than the odd use of ὅτι interrogative, discussed in the number of this JOURNAL for October 1925 (xxvii 58–62), is the idiom of a superfluous ὅτι after the verb 'to say' or the like, introducing not the *oratio obliqua*, as we should expect, but the *oratio recta*. In the large majority of cases, as will be seen, Matthew and (where a parallel is extant) Luke, drop the particle.

I proceed to catalogue some forty instances.

1. i 14, 15 κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ [καὶ] λέγων ὅτι Πεπλήρωται

ὁ καιρὸς . . . μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε . . . Ὅτι is undisputed in Mark, and disappears in Matthew: there is no Lucan parallel. What is doubtful in Mark is λέγων which is omitted by Tischendorf and by W-H margin. But the authorities for omission are quite inadequate (ℵ* Origen c syr-sin), and the constant use of λέγων in the passages to be cited in this list is practically decisive of Marcan usage.

2. i 37 καὶ εὗρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

3. i 40 λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. Ὅτι is dropped by both the other Synoptists. Their influence has caused it to disappear from many authorities in Mark, including C D L W Θ 28 and most Latins: but it has rightly survived in ℵ A B Δ a.

4. ii 12 ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας ὅτι Οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἴδαμεν. Matthew alters the last half of the clause and omits ὅτι: Luke retains. In Mark λέγοντας is omitted by B W b: but the combined evidence of Luke and of Marcan usage is too strong to be overthrown even by B.

5. ii 17 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ . . . οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους. Both Matthew and Luke omit ὅτι: and in this familiar saying of our Lord their texts have exercised even more than their usual disintegrating influence on the authorities for Mark: but ὅτι is rightly retained by B Δ Θ 565.

6. iii 11 τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα . . . ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. No parallel in Matthew: Luke, as in 4, retains λέγοντα ὅτι (iv 41), though λέγοντες, not λέγοντα, must I think be right in Mark. There is the same mixture of masculine and neuter in the story of the demoniac in Mark v 10–13: and the change by scribes of λέγοντες to λέγοντα is far more probable than the converse one. λέγοντες is read only by ℵ D W 69 and a very few others, followed by Tischendorf and W-H margin.

*7. iii 21 ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι Ἐξέστη. There is no parallel in the other Synoptists. But for Marcan usage, we could of course treat ἐξέστη as *oratio obliqua*. [I mark with an asterisk this single instance of past tense after λέγειν ὅτι].

8. iii 22 ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει, καὶ ὅτι Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. Both Matthew and Luke have εἶπον without ὅτι: in Mark only D omits.

[9. iii 28 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke has no parallel. No authorities omit in Mark. I place within square brackets those instances where ὅτι follows ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, since Matthew towards the end of his Gospel not infrequently retains ὅτι in this connexion, see on 34: so too Luke in 32, 34.]

10. iv 21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον

τεθῇ; No parallel in Matthew: and the introductory words as far as ὅτι are dropped in Luke. Most authorities in Mark omit ὅτι: the Ferrar group substitutes ἴδετε: for ὅτι we have B L 892 sah and Marcan usage.

11. v 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλά, λέγων ὅτι Τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει. Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke changes the construction. In Mark some Westerns—D and the Ferrar group: so too the best Old Latins, but in such cases versions must be cited with caution, or perhaps not at all, because the earliest translators rendered with some regard to the genius of their own language—wrongly omit ὅτι.

12. v 28 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι Ἐὰν ἅψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι. Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke is not strictly parallel. In Mark only 28 and 33 of Greek MSS omit.

13. v 35 ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν. Matthew has no parallel: Luke retains the ὅτι, as do all our authorities in Mark.

14. vi 4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. Matthew again omits: no Lucan parallel. In Mark only Δ and the Ferrar group, with a few others, omit.

15. vi 14, 15 ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἠλείας ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Προφήτης . . . Matthew has no parallel to verses 14 and 15: Luke, as in **13**, retains ὅτι, but in each case he has aorist tenses after ὅτι, so that *oratio obliqua* is more easily suggested than by the present tenses of Mark. There is no variation in Mark.

16. vi 18 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάνης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ ὅτι Οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. Once more Matthew drops, and there is no Lucan parallel. Omission in Mark is supported only by D 28 and a very few others.

17. vi 23 καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ ὅτι Ὃ ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι. No Lucan parallel, and in Matthew a change of construction. In Mark we have dissident witnesses in B Δ ὅτι ἐάν, and D εἴ τι ἄν.

18. vi 35 προσελθόντες [αὐτῷ] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος . . . ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς. Both Matthew and Luke omit the ὅτι: but the authorities in Mark are unanimous for it.

19. vii 6 *a* εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν . . . The construction is changed, and ὅτι omitted, in Matt. In Mark the authorities are divided: those who retain ὅτι here omit it later in the sentence (see no. **20**), and *vice versa*, save that Δ Θ 33 omit in both places. No witness gives it in both places: yet Marcan usage suggests that it is right in both. A D W etc. give it here.

20. vii 6 *b* Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἠσαίας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ . . . Matthew drops ὅτι:

Luke ceases to offer any parallels till no. **23**. In Mark only three witnesses support ὅτι, ℵ B L (syr-sin): but Marcan usage puts aside any doubt of their being right.

21. vii 20 ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι Τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Matthew drops the introductory words ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι altogether, so offers no real parallel. No variant in Mark.

22. viii 4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταί τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας; Matthew, as we should guess he would, omits the ὅτι: even in Mark it is found in only three authorities B L Δ, but Marcan usage of course proves it right, and both Tischendorf and W-H accept it.

23. viii 28 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάνην τὸν βαπτιστήν ... ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν. Small wonder that this strange phrase with its tautology εἶπαν λέγοντες is not reproduced by either Matthew or Luke—both drop ὅτι, Matthew drops λέγοντες, and Luke changes it to ἀποκριθέντες. In Mark ℵ*B (syr-sin) are the only witnesses to give ὅτι, of course rightly.[1]

24. ix 31 καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke changes the construction, and so gets rid of it. All authorities retain it in Mark.

[**25**. ix 41 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. There are no parallels in the other Synoptists: in the text of Mark ὅτι is supported by ℵ B C* D L W Δ Θ syr-sin and, exceptionally, by several Latins including k.]

26. x 32, 33 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν, ὅτι Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ... Both Matthew and Luke omit ὅτι: but there is no variant in Mark.

27. xi 17 Οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Both Matthew and Luke turn the question into a statement of fact, and both omit the ὅτι. Omission of ὅτι in Mark is confined to a small group including C D 69.

28. xii 7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν. Again both the other Synoptists drop the ὅτι: and again the omitting group in Mark is small, D Θ 1 28 565 being the only Greek authorities on that side.

29. xii 19 Διδάσκαλε, Μωυσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι Ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ... Once more ὅτι disappears in Matthew and Luke: but in Mark it is only absent from D 69 108 of Greek MSS.

30. xii 28, 29 Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστίν Ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ ... Matthew and Luke both abbreviate here, and both drop not only ὅτι but the words that immediately follow.

[1] It may be noted here that k faithfully reproduces εἶπαν λέγοντες by *dixerunt dicentes*: for *dicentes* and not *omnes* is the true reading of the MS.

The omitting group in Mark tends to be stereotyped: here it is D W Θ 1 28 565 with three other cursives.

31. xii 32 Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε· ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι Εἷς ἐστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. There are no parallels in Matthew or Luke: and no dissentient voices in Mark.

[**32.** xii 43 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχὴ πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν. Ὅτι is retained by Luke (there is no Matthaean parallel) and is found without variant in Mark. As often, the phrase λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι passes unchallenged.]

33. xiii 6 πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι. A striking instance, where the agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark in the omission of ὅτι well reflects the 'usage' of the three writers. In Mark D Θ 33 omit.

[**34.** xiii 30 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη . . . Ὅτι is read by all authorities in Mark and almost all in Luke: in Matt. xxiv 34 the reading is doubtful, but B D L Θ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 give ὅτι, and they outweigh ℵ. The phrase λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι is not so unusual or so repellent to the sense of style as the ordinary Marcan λέγει ὅτι in narrative: and towards the end of the Gospel, as will be seen, Matthew who consistently rejects the latter, not infrequently accepts the former, see nos. **36**, **37**, **39**.]

35. xiv 14 εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅτι Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει· ποῦ ἐστιν τὸ κατάλυμά μου; In Mark some twenty MSS (but none of importance) omit, influenced no doubt by omission in both Matthew and Luke.

[**36.** xiv 18 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με. ὅτι is without variant in Mark and Matthew, cf. no. **34**: in Luke there is no parallel.]

[**37.** xiv 25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου . . . Again no parallel in Luke: again no variant in Mark, but as in **34** authorities are divided over ὅτι in Matt. xxvi 29. For omission are ℵ D Z Θ 1 33 and half a dozen others: for insertion A B C L Δ W and the rest. It is rather surprising that W-H omit without even a marginal variant.]

38. xiv 27 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε. Ὅτι is without variant in Mark, and omission is without variant in Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

[**39.** xiv 30 Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι Σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ . . . τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Ὅτι is without variant in Mark and Matthew: but omission is without variant in Luke.]

40. xiv 57, 58 ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ . . . Ὅτι without variant in Mark: omission without variant in Matthew: no Lucan parallel.

41. xiv 58 ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον

τὸν χειροποίητον . . . The details are the same exactly as in the last case, Matthew omitting ὅτι.

42. xiv 69 ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν τοῖς παρεστῶσιν ὅτι Οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν. Ὅτι is omitted by both Matthew and Luke, but is without variant in Mark.

43. xiv 71 ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο . . . ὀμνύναι ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Transferred without change by Matthew to his own Gospel. Luke, not liking to say that Peter 'cursed and swore', abbreviates the sentence, and in the process drops ὅτι.

44. xiv 72 καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρὶν . . . τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Ὅτι is given by all three Synoptists on the practically unanimous testimony of all Greek MSS other than D.

45. xvi 7 εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι Προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς την Γαλιλαίαν. Ὅτι is retained by Matthew, but the whole sentence undergoes drastic rearrangement in Luke and ὅτι disappears in the process. Did Matthew, towards the end of the Gospel, tire of making as many changes as in the earlier part in the process of making the Marcan material his own? He retains ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι first in 34 (Matt. xxiv 34), and ὅτι in other connexions only in 43, 44, 45 (Matt. xxvi 74, 75, xxviii 7).

What are the results to be gathered from this long enumeration?

In the first place, that in all these forty-five instances not more than four verbs are employed in introducing the ὅτι clause. Three times γράφειν γράφεσθαι (of Scripture), 20, 27, 29: twice ὀμνύναι, 17, 43: twice ἀποκρίνεσθαι, 22, 30: but thirty-eight times λέγειν (εἰπεῖν). The mere statement of 'Marcan usage' is enough to prove that in the one case where our authorities differ, 1, λέγων must be right. Nothing emerges, I think, more decisively from the whole series of notes on 'Marcan usage' than the immense superiority in Mark of the text of B to the text of ℵ. The edition of Tischendorf (and to a less extent that of W-H) is vitiated by the too great deference shewn to the latter MS.

In the second place, if we classify our forty-five instances according to the type of the ὅτι clause, we find

(*a*) that seven times it occurs not in narrative but in direct statements of our Lord, 9, 25, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι . . ., and that the other two Synoptists retain ὅτι in these cases much oftener than in the rest: Matthew accepts it in 34 (probably), 36, 37 (probably), 39—he has no parallel to 25 and 32; Luke has no parallel to 9, 25, 36, 37, but retains ὅτι in 32 and 34. That is to say, Matthew only drops ὅτι once, in 9, Luke only once, in 39. Clearly, then, in dealing with ὅτι *recitativum*, we must isolate these cases from the rest: and indeed they are not strictly 'recitative' at all.

(*b*) that, of the remaining thirty-eight cases, (i) three introduce quotations from Scripture, **20**, **27**, **29**; (ii) two introduce questions, **10** and **22**; (iii) ten[1] introduce statements in the third person which, if they stood alone, might be treated as *oratio obliqua*, **7**, **8**, **14**, **15**, **19**, **21**, **24**, **30**, **31**, **42**; (iv) in the other twenty-three cases ὅτι is followed by a first or second person, so that these are necessarily in *oratio recta*. Now of all these cases, Luke omits ὅτι in all but five (**4**, **6**, **13**, **15**, **44**), Matthew in all but three (**43**, **44**, **45**), sometimes of course by changing the construction, more often by simply dropping the particle. As there are many more parallels in Matthew (thirty-one) than in Luke (twenty-two), the proportion varies as between the two, Luke retaining ὅτι five times out of twenty-two, or nearly one in four, Matthew only three times out of thirty-one, or one in ten.

On twelve occasions Matthew and Luke agree in simply dropping the ὅτι of Mark, **3**, **5**, **8**, **18**, **23**, **26**, **27**, **28**, **29**, **33**, **35**, **42**. Twelve agreements, then, of the two later Synoptists against Mark are cleared off the ground on examination of 'Marcan usage'.

(3) *Asyndeta or absence of particles in Mark.*

The following rough list is probably not at all exhaustive,[2] but it is sufficient to illustrate my point, and it is reinforced (see § 4 below) by the special cases of ναί, οὖν, and ἰδού.

1. i 8 ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι. So ℵ B L Θ 33 69 Origen b c Aug: the rest add μέν with Matthew and Luke.

2. i 22 ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς. So D Θ b c d e: the rest read καὶ οὐχ with Matthew: Luke omits the last half of the phrase.

3. i 27 τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινή. So ℵ B L 33 (*fam.* 1). Not in Matthew: Luke τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ . . . The remaining authorities in Mark prefix τίς ἡ.

4. ii 8, 9 τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε . . . ; τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον . . . ; So Luke: Matthew τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον . . . ;

5. ii 17 οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ . . . οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους . . . As in the last case Luke follows Mark, and Matthew inserts γάρ, οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι . . .

6. ii 21 οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιράπτει. οὐδεὶς δέ Matthew (followed by D and a few Latins in Mark): ὅτι οὐδείς Luke.

7. ii 25, 26 οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ . . . ; εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ . . . So B D (and a 'et'): the remainder πῶς εἰσῆλθεν with Matt.: ὡς εἰσῆλθεν Luke, though B D omit as in Mark, perhaps rightly.

[1] But in only one of these, **7**, is the statement in the past tense.

[2] I have omitted all instances where there is no parallel in Matthew or Luke.

8. iii 27 οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν . . . So A D W and most Greek MSS, e and most Latins, and syr-sin: ℵ B and a few other good authorities prefix ἀλλά, but ἀλλά at the beginning of a sentence is extraordinarily rare in Mark, xiii 24 being the only other example. Luke is not strictly parallel: Matthew has ἢ πῶς . . .

9. iii 34, 35 ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . So B b e (and 'et' a c Aug): the rest read ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ. Matthew ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ: Luke again has no exact parallel.

10. iv 24 βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε· ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. In what are practically the parallels, Matt. vii 2, Luke vi 38, γάρ is added by both the other Synoptists.

11. viii 15 ὁρᾶτε βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων . . . Matthew ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπό, Luke προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπό: βλέπειν ἀπό in the sense 'to beware of' is a Marcan vulgarism (cf. xii 38), which the other Synoptists instinctively avoid. In Mark the reading is not doubtful: but three separate attempts are made in different authorities to emend the text and get rid of the asyndeton or of the double verb: D Θ *fam.* 1 565 omit ὁρᾶτε, Δ omits βλέπετε, C *fam.* 13 insert καί between the verbs.

12. ix 38 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάνης. No parallel in Matthew: Luke ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάνης εἶπεν. In Mark all authorities but ℵ B D Δ Θ sah and a few of the best Old Latins including k, with syr-sin, avoid the asyndeton, either by adding δέ or by prefixing καί.

13. x 9 ὃ ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. No parallel in Luke: Matthew ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς . . ., and from Matthew most MSS of Mark. The true reading without οὖν is preserved only in D and k.

14. x 14 ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά. Both Matthew and Luke alter to καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, and they have drawn after them a large majority of the MSS of Mark. But the shorter reading has for it B W Δ, a dozen more uncials and some eighty cursives.

15. x 24, 25 πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν· εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον. . . Matthew ὅτι εὐκοπώτερον, Luke εὐκοπώτερον γάρ. Evidence for the asyndeton in Mark is only qualified by δέ in A, and γάρ in a few others.

16. x 27 ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . ἐμβλέψας δέ Matthew, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Luke. Most MSS of Mark follow Matthew: the true reading survives in ℵ B C* Δ 1 syr-sin.

17. x 28 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ. τότε ἤρξατο Matthew, εἶπεν δέ Luke. In Mark we find καὶ ἤρξατο, ἤρξατο δέ, τότε ἤρξατο, ἤρξατο οὖν: but ἤρξατο without connecting particle in ℵ A B C W Δ Θ syr-sin, and a good many others.

18. x 29 (the fourth asyndeton in five verses) ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Matthew ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Luke ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. In Mark only ℵ B Δ

give ἔφη alone, and it is possible that with the rest we ought to prefix ἀποκριθείς: but even so most of them retain the asyndeton.

19. xii 9 τί ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; τί οὖν ποιήσει Luke, and similarly Matthew ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει . . . In Mark only B L (syr-sin sah) give the shorter reading without οὖν: but they are certainly right.

20. xii 17 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε (al. Ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος) Καίσαρι. Matthew ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος, Luke τοίνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος. This time only a few authorities in Mark insert οὖν.

21. xii 20 ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν. Luke ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν, Matthew ἦσαν δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοί. In Mark ℵ A B C* L W Δ Θ, the great majority of Greek MSS, syr-sin and k, read as above.

22. xii 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει . . . τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; Both Matthew and Luke insert οὖν: omitted in Mark by ℵ B C* L Δ, many other Greek MSS, and k.

23. xii 24 ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. So in Mark ℵ B C L Δ 33 k, much as in 21 and 22, but without support from later MSS: καὶ εἶπεν Luke, ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ . . . εἶπεν Matthew.

24. xii 36 αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ εἶπεν. So without particle ℵ B L W Δ *fam.* 13 28 565 a k sah: the other MSS mostly αὐτὸς γάρ with Luke. Matthew πῶς οὖν . . .

24 bis. xii 37 αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον. So in Mark ℵ B D L W Δ Θ 28 565 a i k sah (syr-sin). The rest add οὖν after αὐτὸς with Luke Δαυεὶδ οὖν: Matthew εἰ οὖν Δαυεὶδ καλεῖ . . .

25. xiii 5, 6 βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου . . . So ℵ B L W: the rest add γάρ with Matt. and Luke.

26. xiii 7 μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γενέσθαι. So only ℵ B W and the Egyptian versions: the rest have δεῖ γάρ after Matthew and Luke.

27. xiii 8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί. The first ἔσονται with ℵ B D L W 28 124 and the Egyptian versions, the second ἔσονται with ℵ^c B L (W) 28 sah: the rest in each case prefix καί. Matthew and Luke combine the two ἔσονται clauses into one, Matthew connecting with the ἐγερθήσεται clause by καί, Luke by τε.

28. xiii 8 *b* ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα. So without connecting particle Mark: but Matt. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων: no parallel in Luke.

29. xiii 23 ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε· προείρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα. So B L W 28 a: the rest follow Matthew's ἰδοὺ προείρηκα . . . No parallel in Luke.

30. xiii 34 ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφεὶς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ δοὺς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν . . . So all the best authorities in Mark: but many MSS borrow γάρ from Matthew ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν . . . No parallel again in Luke.

31. xiv 3 ἦλθεν γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυ-

τελοῦς· συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς. So only ℵ B L: the rest prefix καί to συντρίψασα. Matthew, omitting συντρίψασα τὴν ἀ., gives καὶ κατέχεεν. Luke omits the whole incident, having related a parallel story in vii 36–50: this covers also **32**, **33**.

32. xiv 6 τί αὐτῇ κόπους παρέχετε; καλὸν ἔργον ἠργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί. So all but a few MSS of Mark: ℵ W *fam.* 13 28 have καλὸν γὰρ ἔργον with Matthew's ἔργον γὰρ καλὸν . . .

33. xiv 8 ὃ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν· προέλαβεν μυρίσαι μου τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. The asyndeton is without variant in Mark: Matthew adds γάρ, βαλοῦσα γὰρ αὕτη τὸ μύρον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου.

34. xiv 19 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς κατὰ εἷς· Μήτι ἐγώ; So ℵ B L Origen in Mark: nearly all the rest avoid the asyndeton by οἱ δὲ ἤρξαντο . . ., not on this occasion following Matthew's καὶ λυπούμενοι σφόδρα ἤρξαντο λέγειν . . . There is therefore somewhat less certainty in this case: yet Marcan usage, combined with the excellent record of B in the whole series of passages here enumerated, is I think decisive. Luke, as so often in the Passion narrative (cf. **35**), has no parallel.

35. xiv 41 καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἰδοὺ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . So with few exceptions (D W and Old Latins) the texts of Mark: Matthew omits the difficult ἀπέχει, and substitutes ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται . . .

36. xiv 63, 64 τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας.[1] No important witness differs in Mark save ℵ, which follows Matthew ἴδε νῦν ἠκούσατε . . . Luke αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν . . .

37. xvi 6 μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον. Mark leaves us in doubt whether the second clause is a statement or a question: Matthew with οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι . . . ζητεῖτε interprets in the former sense, Luke with τί ζητεῖτε in the latter.

38. xvi 6 *b* ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε. So Mark without variant: Matthew οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἠγέρθη γάρ. Luke οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη.

These passages are enough to prove to demonstration, in the first place, Mark's fondness for asyndeta—it corresponds to his rough unliterary style—and, in the second place, the constant tendency in Matthew and Luke to remove the asyndeta by providing particles to supply some sort of connexion with what precedes. Sometimes, as we should expect, they provide the same particles, sometimes different ones. Out of some twenty-five cases where both Matthew and Luke have parallels to the Marcan text, Luke retains the asyndeton twice (**4** and **5**),[2] Matthew never: in twelve cases they give different supple-

[1] I think 'Marcan usage' is decisive against W-H's punctuation ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας; Compare e.g. ii 7, the statement βλασφημεῖ between two questions.

[2] Possibly also in **7**.

ments, in ten cases the same, namely 1 μέν, 10 γάρ, 14 καί, 16 δέ, 18 δέ, 19 οὖν, 22 οὖν, 24 *bis* οὖν, 25 γάρ, 26 γάρ. Ten cases may seem a large proportion: but the supplements are always natural ones, or indeed the most natural ones, and the agreements against Mark—side by side with a rather larger number of divergent supplements—mean no more than that the two later Synoptists, editing the text of the earlier Gospel, often hit independently on the same obvious improvements.

But further we learn of course something of the relative value of our authorities for the text of St Mark. In this particular section of our enquiry, the excellence of B stands out unchallenged: in eight instances the asyndeton is practically without variant, at any rate in all the older authorities, but in the remaining thirty-one B is right—on the assumption that an 'asyndeton' reading is to be preferred—in no less than twenty-eight, the exceptions being 2, 8, and 13. ℵ is right in twenty-one cases; the exceptions (besides the three just mentioned, which it shares with B) are 7, 9, 14, 19, 29, 32, 36. D is right in only nine cases, though it should be noted that in 2, 7, 12, 13, 28, it gives the shorter reading with only a few companions. But k, for the part of the Gospel for which it is extant (from 12 onwards), has a better record than D of asyndeta: 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 24 bis, four times against D. In 13, a quite certain case, D k stand alone with the right reading.

(4). *Particles absent from Mark.*

i. ναί.

ναί is found eight times in Matthew, v 37, ix 28, xi 9, xi 26, xiii 51, xv 27, xvii 25, xxi 16: four times in Luke, vii 26, x 21, xi 51, xii 5. On two occasions the passages in Matthew and Luke are parallel, Matt. xi 9 = Luke vii 26 ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν περισσότερον προφήτου, Matt. xi 26 = Luke x 21 ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου: both passages presumably come from Q. But further the two other occasions where ναί is found in Luke belong also it would seem to Q sections: Luke xi 51 ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν (Matthew ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν), xii 5 ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν (omitted by Matthew). It is possible therefore that Luke never uses ναί except where he is following Q.

Of the other six instances in Matthew, five occur in matter not found in Mark: the sixth, Matt. xv 27, is parallel to Mark vii 28. The printed texts give ναί in both Gospels as introducing the answer of the Syrophenician woman to our Lord's objection about throwing the children's bread to dogs. There is no other case of the use of ναί in St Mark: and 'Marcan usage' is reinforced by the testimony of witnesses who omit it even here.

These witnesses are D W Θ *fam.*13 565 b c ff i syr-sin: all 'Western'

indeed, but Western of very varied types. It is noteworthy that W-H gave the omission of *ναί* a place in the margin of their edition before the evidence of either W or Θ or the Sinai Syriac was available: and obviously, whatever was to be said on internal grounds before the new witnesses were known, the external evidence is now very strongly reinforced. The ℵ B group, in fact, have suffered assimilation to Matthew: and the solitary instance of *ναί* in St Mark disappears.[1]

ii. οὖν.

οὖν is found in Matthew nearly sixty times, in Luke some thirty times—i.e. in proportion to the length of his Gospel about half as often as in Matthew—in Mark at the outside seven times: but on three of these seven W-H omit *οὖν* entirely, and on a fourth they bracket it. The weight of 'Marcan usage' is so strong that omission is presumably right where there is even a small body of good witnesses in support of it; and possibly right, where a parallel in Matthew will account for its insertion, without any external evidence at all.

1. x 9 *ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.* So word for word Matthew, and so the critical editions of Mark with the vast majority of MSS. But D k omit *οὖν*: and omission is so like Mark's style, while the correction from Matthew would be so easily and so obviously made, in a terse familiar saying, that I accept the shorter reading without hesitation. See Asyndeta **13**.

2. xi 31 *ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· Διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;* Here Matthew has *οὖν*, but it is important to note that it is absent from Luke: and omission in Mark has for it A C* L W a b c d ff i k syr-sin. W-H give omission a place in the margin; but where Marcan usage, Lucan parallel, and good Greek and Latin evidence, all coincide, omission is, I think, incontestably right.

3. xii 8, 9 *καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. τί οὖν ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος;* So all MSS of Mark, except B L (syr-sin) sah. But both Luke and Matthew have *οὖν*, Luke following Mark closely *τί οὖν ποιήσει* . . ., Matthew inserting it into an introductory clause *ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει* . . . We shall have therefore no hesitation in accepting, with Tischendorf and W-H, the evidence of B, and in ejecting once more the particle *οὖν* from the text of Mark.

4. xii 23 *ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν* . . . So (or *ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει*) many MSS of Mark, including A D W Θ 1 28 565 and most Latins, with Matthew *ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν* . . . and Luke *ἡ γυνὴ οὖν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει* . . .

[1] I have dealt with this reading, more briefly, in my *Study of the New Testament* (ed. 2, 1924) p. 70.

Omit οὖν in Mark with ℵ B C* L Δ, very many Greek MSS, and k: so also Tischendorf and W-H. See under Asyndeta **22**.

5. xii 37 αὐτὸς οὖν Δαυεὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον. So in Mark A and the great majority of Greek MSS, compare Luke Δαυεὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ, and Matthew εἰ οὖν Δαυεὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον . . . Again omit οὖν in Mark with ℵ B D L W Δ Θ 28 565 a i k, the Egyptian versions (syr-sin), and the critical editions. See Asyndeta **24** bis.

6. xiii 35 γρηγορεῖτε οὖν· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται. No variant in Mark: and though οὖν may conceivably have been borrowed by the scribes of Mark from Matt. xxiv 42 (there is no parallel in Luke), it would be hazardous to question it without any MS support, the more so that there is another instance to follow where our authorities are unanimous for the word.

7. xv 12 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Τί οὖν θέλετε[1] ποιήσω ὃν λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Again no variant in Mark, τί οὖν in Matthew, and no parallel in Luke. The same considerations apply as in the last case: I am not sure that οὖν in Mark is right, but I should not venture to remove it from the text.

Thus out of seven instances οὖν should be banished from Mark in five. In three of these both Matthew and Luke have the particle: that is to say, three instances of agreement between the two other Synoptists against Mark are seen to be meaningless, because we have once more the key to the solution in 'Marcan usage'.

iii. ἰδού *in narrative.*

Neither Mark nor John ever uses ἰδού in narrative: Luke employs it fairly often (sixteen times), Matthew twice as often (thirty-two times) as Luke. In Luke it is regularly in the form καὶ ἰδού: that is also the predominant form in Matthew, but ἰδού is also found in this Gospel with a genitive absolute preceding it as often as nine times. In both Matthew and Luke the usage is found alike in portions that are parallel to Mark and portions that are not—about three-quarters of the instances in Matthew and something over half of the instances in Luke belonging to the 'triple tradition'.

There are in fact some twenty-five passages where one or other of the later Synoptists grafts ἰδού on to the Marcan stock, three of these being peculiar to Luke, sixteen peculiar to Matthew, and six common to both. Again it may be asked, Is not this a high percentage of agreement?

[1] W-H omit θέλετε with ℵ B C Δ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 33 and the Egyptian versions: but the omission I believe to be due either to assimilation to Matt. xxvii 22 or to a desire to get rid of the construction θέλετε ποίησω. Tischendorf retains θέλετε.

In two out of every three cases where Luke uses it Matthew has it too, and can this be due to chance? The answer is twofold.

In the first place Matthew uses the phrase so commonly, when a new character or new element in the story is introduced, that it is not wonderful that Luke, using it much more sparingly, should be found to coincide with Matthew in a high proportion of his relatively few cases. If ἰδού were to be introduced at all, certain occasions would stand out as specially calling for it. The six occasions common to Matthew and Luke are in fact (*a*) the commencement of three stories of miracles, Mark i 40, ii 3, v 22: (*b*) the appearance of Moses and Elias at the Transfiguration, Mark ix 4: (*c*) the appearance of Judas in the Garden, Mark xiv 43: (*d*) the appearance of the angel or angels who announced the Resurrection, Mark xvi 5.

In the second place, as Mark is *never* found to use the phrase in narrative, we can hardly explain any coincidences of Matthew and Luke against Mark as pointing back to a more original text of Mark. It was not Mark, but much more probably the Old Testament, that taught Matthew, and to a less degree Luke, the value of the employment of ἰδού to give vigour and movement to the narrative.[1]

VIII. 'The disciples' *and* 'the Twelve'.[2]

Eduard Meyer, in his important work *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (3 vols., Stuttgart and Berlin, 1921–3), attempts to analyse the sources of St Mark and assumes a distinction between a 'disciples' source and a 'Twelve' source according as οἱ μαθηταί or οἱ δώδεκα is the phrase employed (i 133–147).

These 'Notes on Marcan usage' are being put together primarily as a contribution to the examination of the history of the text and of the Synoptic problem. But it is also part of their purpose to test, and if the evidence tends that way to establish the truth of, my own working hypothesis that the authority of St Peter stands, as tradition has always indicated, very closely behind the authority of the Evangelist.

Of course it goes without saying that that hypothesis applies especially

[1] It is worth noting that in several of the cases where Matthew and Luke have ἰδού, it replaces an ἔρχεται of St Mark: Mark i 40, ii 3, v 22.

[2] The following pages were originally written as an appendix to 'Marcan usage: V. 'The movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd' (*J. T. S.* April 1925, xxvi 225–240), where I tried to emphasize the indications in Mark, as contrasted with Matthew and Luke, of the evidence of an eye-witness, indications which appear to be spread over practically the whole story of the Ministry. It seems simpler now to print this examination of a rival theory as an independent section of my Notes.

to the period between St Peter's call (i 16) and the flight of the disciples (xiv 50). For the story of the Baptism[1] and Temptation the ultimate authority must be that of Jesus himself, though it must have reached the Evangelist through the medium of some personal disciple to whom Jesus had confided it—naturally, in this case, St Peter. For the story of the Crucifixion and (so far as the extant part of the Gospel extends) the Resurrection one primary authority is presumably that of the holy women or one of them—if one must select, that one whose name is otherwise unknown to us, Mary the mother of James and Joses.

But it does not follow that, even if the authority of St Peter stands in the main behind the narrative i 16–xiv 50, it stands in equal degree behind every part of it. Distinction must be made in the first place between that part of the story where we may presume that he was spectator or auditor, and those exceptional passages where the contrary was certainly or probably the case. There is the story of Herod and John the Baptist, vi 14–29: there is perhaps the journey of our Lord to Tyre and back, vii 24–37, where from the absence of any allusion to disciples it may not improbably be deduced that the journey was undertaken without companions.

Even in these passages the information may still have reached the Evangelist by way of St Peter. But I should not want to exclude the possibility that there may be episodes which the Evangelist derived from other sources and has interwoven into the Petrine tradition. Such in particular might be the second account of miraculous feeding, viii 1–9, of which the most probable explanation seems to me to be that it is a variant, derived by Mark from another source, of the first (Petrine) account in vi 34–44.[2]

But returning, with the reserves indicated, to the working hypothesis that the account of the Ministry is a homogeneous whole depending on the Petrine tradition, let us see whether the actual use or interchange of the phrases 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve' suggests an actual inter-

[1] Note that in St Mark's Gospel, and in his Gospel only, the Baptism is related throughout as our Lord's experience: i 10 ἀναβαίνων . . . εἶδεν, i 11 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός. Matthew changes the latter part, and, as in the Transfiguration where the Voice from heaven is addressed to the three apostles (Mk. ix 7 = Matt. xvii 5 = Lk. ix 35), writes οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου . . ., while Luke changes the former part into a historical statement, ἐγένετο . . . ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν . . . καὶ φωνὴν . . . γενέσθαι: Matt. iii 17, Lk. iii 21, 22.

[2] See Dr Headlam's *Jesus the Christ* (1923), p. 14. As Dr Headlam points out, the second distinguishes itself from the first by the absence of those vivid details which we are accustomed to call 'Marcan touches'. But if these details are found in the Petrine, and are absent from the non-Petrine account, the important conclusion results that the vivid touches of the Evangelist go back in the main to the apostle. It does not follow, of course, that the disciple and 'interpreter' has not caught something of the style and spirit of his master.

change of sources or whether it grows naturally out of the situation in the process of developement described in St Mark's Gospel. That is the first test of all theories of partition of sources, whether in this or any other document.

Μαθηταί are first mentioned in ii 15, when we are told that they were now 'many' and were beginning to collect round him and 'follow' him: before that we have only (1) the call of four disciples who came 'after him' (ὀπίσω, i 17, 20)—these form at once a group of four (i 29): it may be only these four, it may already be others, who are included in the 'Simon and his companions' of i 36—and (2) the call of a fifth personally named disciple,[1] with the summons 'Follow me', in ii 14. Then we hear (in the next verse) of the 'many disciples' who were 'following' Jesus. From this point onwards begins the regular usage of the word, perhaps 'thy disciples'[2] ii 18, at any rate 'his disciples' in ii 23, iii 7, 9.

Obviously the term 'the Twelve' cannot be used till the formal separation of an inner group among the disciples, iii 13 ff, and obviously at that point the use of some such phrase was imperative to express what was happening, and all three Synoptists agree so far. Luke (vi 13–17), unlike Matthew, keeps close to the order of Mark, but inverts the call of the twelve apostles and the notice of the wide districts from which hearers were now being attracted. In Mark it may be supposed that it was just the extension of the work which caused our Lord to create the first rudiments of organization in selecting the Twelve to be his

[1] Levi, son of Alpheus, who is not identified either by Mark, or by Luke who follows Mark (Luke v 27–29), with Matthew. On the other hand we should naturally suppose that one whose call is thus given in detail was in fact one of the Twelve, as his brother 'James son of Alpheus' (Mark iii 18) certainly was. The Western text solves the difficulty by reading 'James [not Levi] son of Alpheus' in Mark ii 14; but St Luke's support of 'Levi' seems to disprove this otherwise attractive solution. We may perhaps either suppose that Λεββαῖον of the Western text is right in the list of the Apostles iii 18—Θαδδαῖον would then have come in from Matt. x 3—and that Λεββαῖος is a variant form of Λευείν (Origen has ὁ Λεβῆς τελώνης); or alternatively that we should read in iii 18 Ἰάκωβον [καὶ Λευείν] τὸν Ἀλφαίου. If the mention of Levi had accidently dropped out from a very early copy, we could understand both the presence of the variants Θαδδαῖος and Λεββαῖος in Mark and Matthew and the appearance in Luke of a new name Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. The number of the Twelve had somehow to be filled up. [I think I owe this suggestion to the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson].

[2] Probably B is right in omitting μαθηταί, and reading οἱ δὲ σοὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν: for (1) Luke has not got the word, which a little suggests that he did not find it in Mark, (2) the MSS which give it differ among themselves as to the place where they put it. I think it has come in from Matt. ix 14; and, if so, the reason of Mark's phrase may be that Jews hardly recognized the new Teacher's followers yet as organized 'disciples' in the same sense as those of the Baptist and of the Pharisees—it is something like 'Your people'.

companions and his delegates. Of the actual call Luke's account is limpid in its clearness, 'He called his disciples, and chose out of them twelve, whom he named "apostles", Simon, whom he named Peter, and . . .' Doubtless Luke understands himself to be giving the sum of Mark's rather involved account, 'He called whom he would and they came to him and he appointed twelve to be' his companions and apostolic delegates; 'and he appointed the Twelve and gave Simon the name Peter, and James . . .': and it is just this involved character of Mark's account which prompts Meyer to see in it, quite unnecessarily as I think, a conflation of two separate strata of tradition.

In the first place, then, when Mark says 'he called whom he would and they came to him and he appointed twelve', I do not think he means to describe two acts, as Luke thought, but one. 'He summoned whom he would' is in fact the selection of the Twelve: and so Matthew appears to understand him when writing 'He summoned his twelve disciples' Matt. x 1—odd as is the phrase τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς αὐτοῦ, when we have so far heard nothing about the disciples being twelve. Mark's καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα is a characteristic piece of redundancy, due to his desire to emphasize the formal nature of the act, and should not be separated from the preceding verse by more than a comma.

So far any difficulty has been removed by exegesis and punctuation: for the next problems textual evidence must be called in to assist. Modern critics seem fairly unanimous in following Tischendorf, as against Westcott and Hort, and ejecting the words οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν from verse 14 as a plain contamination from Luke vi 13. Decision is not quite so simple as to the opening words of verse 16, καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα: but the omitting and inserting groups are so nearly the same as in the last case that, if there is anything in the principle *noscitur a sociis*, this phrase is naturally treated as a companion interpolation and should also disappear.[1] The names in the accusative, verses 17–19, will then depend directly on ἐποίησεν of verse 14, an awkwardness which Matthew removes by commencing a new sentence, 'Now the names of the Twelve Apostles were these'. Meyer's mountain has by now crumbled down to the rather ungrammatical parenthesis 'and he gave Simon the name Peter'.[2]

[1] οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν absent from A C² D L W all Latins syr-sin and Armenian: found in ℵ B C* (*ut vid*) Δ Θ Ferrar group 28 sah. καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, absent from A C² D L W Θ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 all Latins syr-sin sah and Armenian: found in ℵ B C* Δ 565 700. The latter insertion may have been a marginal gloss to καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα of verse 14: the glossator wanted to substitute 'the Twelve' for 'twelve', and fearing that a mere τούς would not make his meaning clear, wrote the phrase in full.

[2] If with the Ferrar group and sah we could for ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα read πρῶτον Σίμωνα, the last difficulty would go. But the evidence is far too slight, I am afraid.

Our Lord had thus formed an inner circle, for intimate companionship and for missionary work, out of the whole number of his disciples. That is exactly the situation reflected in the two next mentions of the Twelve. In iv 10 'those who were round him with the Twelve' οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, ask of him the meaning of the parables. In vi 7 he summons the Twelve, and sends them out in pairs on a missionary tour, προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο: in vi 30 the 'apostles' or 'missionaries' return and report to him the results, and he retires with them privately to the wilder country across the lake.

That is to say, he is from now onwards more and more concentrating himself on the training of a select few, more and more withdrawing himself from his public ministry in Galilee. It was not done at any definite moment. There is a transition period, during which he reappears from time to time in Capernaum and its neighbourhood. 'His disciples' is a general term describing those who were associated with him at any particular moment. It becomes therefore a synonym for the Twelve, just in proportion as he journeys about more and more exclusively with them. Only the Twelve were with him in the desert place to which he retired for privacy, so that οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ in the episode of the feeding of the multitudes who had followed him there (vi 35–41) are naturally the Twelve. On the other hand when he returned to the west of the lake and the neighbourhood of Capernaum, 'his disciples' (vii 2) may reassume the larger meaning, though it should be noted that 'his disciples' who enter the house with him (vii 17) cannot have been an indefinitely large company.

From vii 24 to vii 37 there is no mention either of the Twelve or of the disciples: Jesus was, it would seem, alone. The succeeding verses, viii 1–10 are probably a variant tradition of vi 35–45. In the continuous narrative 'his disciples' first therefore reappear at viii 27 on the road to Caesarea Philippi, on the occasion of the great confession of faith which forms the climax of the earlier part of the Ministry. If I read the Gospel rightly, the 'disciples' are from this point onwards practically identical with the Twelve, and I do not think that the Evangelist or his authority intended to make distinction between them. Perhaps the summoning of 'the crowd with his disciples', viii 34, may denote the older and larger body of followers. But the interval, if it was an interval, was a brief one, for less than a week (ix 2) separates the Confession from the Transfiguration, and the disciples of viii 27 are presumably also the disciples of ix 14. From Caesarea Philippi to Jerusalem the record is one of almost continuous movement. Once indeed Jesus revisited the scene of his earlier preaching, but it was, if one may use the phrase, incognito: 'they passed along through

Galilee, and he would not that any should know,' for the subject-matter of his teaching was appropriate to a narrower circle only, ix 30, 31. Three times the Evangelist reiterates the prophecy of the Passion, viii 31, ix 31, x 33. On the first occasion the recipients were apparently the group of disciples who accompanied Jesus on the way to Caesarea Philippi, since when Peter was shocked by what was told him and burst into vehement protest, Jesus 'turned round and saw his disciples', viii 32, 33. On the second occasion the teaching was again addressed to 'his disciples', ix 31; on the third to the Twelve, x 32–34. There is an increasing definiteness of detail in the prophecy, but there seems to be no suggestion that those to whom it is addressed are other than before.

No other interpretation of the later chapters of the Gospel, viii 27 onwards (with the possible exception of viii 34), is so simple and so satisfactory as that which treats the phrases 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve', οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ and οἱ δώδεκα, as practically synonyms.

'He was teaching his disciples . . . and they came to Capernaum, and after going indoors he asked them what they had been talking about . . . and he called the Twelve . . . and set a child in the middle of them,' ix 31–35. Is it reasonable to think that one set of persons had been discussing who was greatest, and that the moral was pointed to a different set?

The next two examples of the use of 'the disciples' tell us just the same tale. 'And when he was in the house the disciples again put questions to him about' the teaching he had been giving on divorce, x 10. Again we remind ourselves that those 'in the house' must have been a limited number, as in vii 17 and ix 33. And when 'the disciples' rebuked the forwardness of the mothers who brought children for his blessing, our Lord expressed his indignation in similar words and with the same action, ἐναγκαλισάμενος, as he had employed on the last occasion of the mention of the Twelve, x 13–16, cf ix 36, 37.[1]

After the episode of the rich young man, 'Jesus looked round on his disciples' with the saying 'How hard it will be for those with possessions to enter into the Kingdom of God', x 23. But immediately after, x 24, the disciples are addressed as τέκνα—here only in the Gospels, save for

[1] If these two episodes stood alone, there would no doubt be something to be said for Meyer's hypothesis: the 'Twelve' source and the 'disciples' source had each, it might be suggested with some reason, an episode which emphasized by an appropriate action the necessity of the childlike spirit, the two stories being really variant accounts of the same thing. But they do not stand alone. We have in fact abundant evidence for the repetition by Jesus of the same teaching on different occasions, and also for the indifferent use by Mark, in the later chapters of his Gospel (ix 31, 35; xi 11, 14; xiv 12, 17), of the two phrases 'his disciples' and 'the Twelve' in reference to the same occasions.

Jo. xiii 33, τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί—a term indicative of affection and intimacy such as could not be applied outside a very narrow circle. Those to whom he spoke had given up home and everything to follow him (x 28). That need not mean the Twelve only: but it must mean a very few.

'And they were on the road going up to Jerusalem: and Jesus went on ahead . . . and they followed him in fear. And he took the Twelve again into his company', and repeated to them the prophecy of the Passion, connecting it now definitely with the very journey on which they had set out, x 32–34. It is an unnatural exegesis to distinguish between those from whom Jesus for the moment separated himself, and those whom he took 'again' into his company.

Precisely the same conclusion is suggested by the request of the brothers James and John, x 35 ff. It created grave indignation—among whom? among 'the disciples'? No, but among the remaining members of the Twelve, οἱ δέκα, x 41. There may have been some few others with him: but it is the Twelve who fill the foreground throughout the journey.

Once more 'his disciples' leave Jericho with Jesus and the crowd, x 46: 'they draw near Jerusalem', and at the Mount of Olives he sends on 'two of his disciples' to prepare for the triumphal entry, xi 1: he entered the city, went into the Temple, swept his glance round over everything, but it was late and he did no more that night, but went out to Bethany—with the Twelve, μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα, xi 11. Next day on his return he pronounced the doom of the barren fig-tree 'and his disciples heard it' xi 14. Were the Twelve, then, who went out with him to Bethany in the evening, different from the 'disciples' who came back with him in the morning?

From xi 27 to xii 34 the narrative is occupied by the public debates, if we may so put it, with the authorities at large, with the different parties separately, and with an individual scribe. The crisis is approaching: the breach is complete: for the last time Jesus teaches the crowd, and forces the situation by direct denunciation of the religious leaders of the people. If they give largely to the treasury, their income is extracted from helpless widows: and one such widow, he tells 'his disciples', had given more than any of them, xii 35–44.

As he left the Temple, 'one of his disciples' called his attention to its magnificence: he answered with a prophecy of its destruction. They ascended the Mount of Olives: and the four leading apostles—the only apostles, unless Levi was one, who are mentioned by name (apart from Judas Iscariot) in the Gospel—asked him to explain himself further. It was apparently in answer to their request, and to them only, that he imparted his teaching about the End, xiii 5–37.

So far then in these chapters there seems no valid reason for distinguishing between 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve': and now we come immediately [1] to a very clear case for identification in xiv 12–17, where 'his disciples say to him Where do you want us to go and prepare for your passover? and he sends two of his disciples [Peter and John, according to Luke xxii 8] . . . and the disciples went out and . . . found just what he told them and prepared the passover: and in the evening he came with the Twelve'. Once more we ask, were the disciples who spoke about the passover in the morning a separate set from the Twelve who kept it with Jesus in the evening?

After this the phrase οἱ δώδεκα is not used again, save as a definition of Judas Iscariot, xiv 10,[2] 20, 43: nor οἱ μαθηταί, save in the Garden of Gethsemane, xiv 32, where it must mean those who were at the Last Supper, and in the angelic message, xvi 7, where it is in close connexion with Peter, εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ. 'His disciples' are a group of which Peter is head. It is impossible not to be reminded of the apostolic Creed-form in 1 Cor. xv 3–5 παρέλαβον . . . ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα.

The argument here developed does not imply an absolute identification of the phrases 'the disciples' 'the Twelve' in the latter part of St Mark's Gospel. There may have been a few in the band that accompanied Jesus on his last journey who were on the fringe of the Twelve but not actually belonging to it. What is asserted is that for practical purposes the phrases come to the same thing, and that the Evangelist neither meant a sharp distinction himself between the two nor composed his narrative out of two sources each of which used one, and one only, of them. The discrimination of sources in the case of secondary documents like Matthew and Luke is of course one of the principal tasks of the critic. That every document is constructed on the basis of different literary sources is an assumption and an unjustifiable one. That Mark in particular used a 'disciple' source and a 'Twelve' source is in my judgement pure fantasy—or rather it could only be due to fantasy if it were not in fact due rather to *Tendenz*.

Meyer has made up his mind that Jesus cannot have foreseen the continuity of the movement which he called into being so far as to have equipped it with the rudiments of authority, and in that sense of organization, in the persons of the Twelve. That conclusion can only be established by a ruthless undermining of the evidence of St Mark's

[1] The reading of D and some Latins (not k) in xiv 4 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ is a mere assimilation to Matt. xxvi 8.

[2] xiv 10 ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα ℵ B C* L. The reading is too strange to be an invention. I take it to mean 'the Judas who was one of the Twelve' as opposed to the Judas who was, according to St Mark's list, not of the Twelve.

Gospel as it stands: and Meyer does not shrink from this. I have tried to shew on the other hand, firstly, that this Gospel represents a natural developement in the Ministry of Jesus by which he gradually restricted his teaching, as it became more advanced and faced more and more clearly the apparent failure of the movement, to a limited number of his followers; and secondly, that the 'disciples' who receive this later teaching being in effect the 'Twelve', the Evangelist uses one or other phrase indifferently to describe them, and that any analysis which attempts to separate the two uses as indicating two rival sources raises so many difficulties that it can only be called, even on literary grounds, a failure.

C. H. TURNER.

THE MEMORIA APOSTOLORUM ON THE VIA APPIA.

THE excavations which have taken place in recent years beneath the Church of S. Sebastiano have awakened great interest on account of the light thrown by them on the cult of the Apostles Peter and Paul on the site now occupied by that church, which in its present form is a building of the sixteenth century. They have been officially described in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, series v, vol. xx (1923), by G. Mancini and O. Marucchi, and have been the subject of a large literature, to which the most important of recent contributions is the posthumous article of Mgr Duchesne in the *Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di Archeologia*, series iii, *Memorie* vol. i. Since the work of excavation has, at any rate for the time being, ceased, the time seems opportune for a provisional interpretation of the results obtained in the light of the traditions connected with the site.

The existence of a liturgical cult of the Apostles in this region as early as the fourth century is established by a comparison of the *Depositio martyrum*, a document incorporated in the Calendar of Philocalus (A. D. 354) and the fuller versions of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, which may be presumed to go back to the fifth-century original. In the *Depositio* we have the entry (under June 29) *Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense, Tusco et Basso Consulibus*; while the fullest form of the entry in the *Martyrologium* reads thus:—*Romae Via Aurelia, natale Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, Petri in Vaticano, Pauli vero in via Ostensi, utrumque in Catacumbas, passi sub Nerone, Basso et Tusco consulibus*. The consular date is A. D. 258, and its presence in the entry can only be explained by some connexion with the celebration *in Catacumbas*, which took place in addition to those

NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*)

VIII. *Auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs.*

i. *The past tense of the substantive verb* ἦν ἦσαν *with present active, present or perfect passive, participle as auxiliary; exactly equivalent to our English* 'was' 'were' *with present and past participle* (*rare in Matthew: frequent in Mark and Luke*)

1. i 6 ἦν ὁ Ἰωάνης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου . . . καὶ ἔσθων ἀκρίδας. No parallel in Luke: altered by Matthew. In classical Greek this construction would be quite regular, but the tense would be pluperfect and the meaning 'had been clothed'. Mark means 'was clothed'.

2. i 13 ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ . . . πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, 'was . . . being tempted', though both A.V. and R.V. have, less exactly, 'was . . . tempted'. Neither Matthew nor Luke is strictly parallel. Present passive participle only once again, in 17.

3. i 22 ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, 'was teaching'. The only case where both Matthew and Luke retain the Marcan construction.

4. i 33 ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν. Not (of course) 'had been gathered', but 'was gathered'. No Synoptic parallel.

5. i 39 ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, 'was preaching'. As pointed out in ch. III of these Notes (*J. T. S.*, Oct. 1924, xxvi p. 15) W-H give a wrong reading here with ℵ B L ἦλθεν, due to the desire to find a construction for εἰς. Not only does the Lucan parallel (iv 44) support ἦν, but Mark i 14 is decisive on the same side: Jesus 'came into Galilee preaching' at the outset of His ministry, here He 'continued preaching'. Luke retains the construction, Matthew alters it.

6. ii 6 ἦσαν δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι, 'were sitting there and discussing'. Matthew alters: Luke retains ἦσαν καθήμενοι, but removes it to the opening of the story, v 17.

7. ii 18 ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάνου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. The statement is dropped at this point by both Matthew and Luke.

8. iv 38 αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ . . . καθεύδων. Again altered by both, by Matthew to the imperfect, by Luke to an aorist.

9. v 5 ἦν κράζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις, 'continually, night and day . . . he was crying out and cutting himself . . .' The verse is dropped in both derivative accounts.

10. v 11 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ . . . ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη. Retained by Matthew, probably because the verb need not go with the participle: 'there was there a great herd feeding', rather than 'a great herd was feeding there'. Luke makes that clearer by altering to βοσκομένων.[1]

11. vi 52 ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη. No parallels.

12. ix 4 καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Both Matthew and Luke alter, Luke to the imperfect συνελάλουν, Matthew by suppressing ἦσαν and connecting the participle with the preceding verb.

13. x 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων χρήματα [*v.l.* κτήματα] πολλά. Here it is Matthew who retains the Marcan construction, Luke who alters it (ἦν πλούσιος): but see further, on this verse and context, § v 15 below, p. 359.

14. x 32 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Luke omits the verse, Matthew quite alters the construction.

15. x 32 *b* καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. No parallels.

16. xiv 4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς. No parallel in Luke: Matthew alters to the aorist.

17. xiv 40 ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι. Matthew retains the construction but alters the present to the perfect participle: by so doing he may keep the letter of grammatical rule, but it is to the havoc of the sense, for the pluperfect is quite out of place. Their eyes 'were being weighed down', not 'had been weighed down'. There is no parallel in Luke.

18. xiv 49 καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων. Altered by Luke to a participle, ὄντος μου (avoiding two verbs connected with καί), by Matthew, because he disliked the construction, to ἐκαθεζόμην.

19. xiv 54 ἦν συνκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν. Here for the first time both Matthew and Luke make the same alteration, substituting ἐκάθητο for ἦν συνκαθήμενος—though one has μετὰ τῶν with Mark and the other μέσος αὐτῶν. But it is not beyond the ordinary doctrine of chances that in this solitary case out of a list of twenty-four passages the two later Evangelists should independently hit on so simple a change.

20. xv 7 ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος. 'Now the fellow called Barabbas was . . . lying in prison': A.V. wrongly separates ἦν from δεδεμένος, rendering 'there was one . . . Barabbas which lay bound'; R.V. is ambiguous. Mark's whole reference to Barabbas is so awkwardly expressed, that it is not to be wondered at that the story is re-drafted by the other two Evangelists.

21. xv 26 ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη. Both the others change, partly perhaps because the brevity of the Marcan account

[1] βοσκομένη in Luke viii 32, in spite of the strong authority of א B D (not d) Θ a, looks like an assimilation to Matthew (and Mark).

seemed to call for expansion: Mark e.g. does not tell us where the inscription was put.

22. xv 40 ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι. Retained by Matthew, probably for the reason suggested on no. **10** above: altered by Luke.

23. xv 43 ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Altered by both, by Luke to the imperfect of the same verb, by Matthew to the aorist of another verb.

24. xv 46 ἐν μνήματι ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, 'which was hewn out' A.V. rightly: R.V. which had rendered the idiom rightly in **1**, **4**, **11**, **21**, at last found a chance to hark back to the classical pluperfect, 'which had been hewn out'. But Marcan usage is clear. Matthew changes to the active ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ, Luke to the shorter but perhaps more ambiguous phrase ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ.

The number of instances cited shews that we have here a favourite locution of Mark. No difference has been made in the list between instances of the present active (or passive **2**, **17**) participle and instances of the perfect passive participle, because it does not appear that Mark made any. But his most characteristic usage is with the present participle, ([**2**], **3**, **5**, **6**, **7**, **8**, **9**, **10**, **12**, **13**, **14**, **15**, **16**, [**17**], **18**, **19**, **22**, **23**, or three out of every four cases), and it is exactly equivalent to our own use of the auxiliary verb and participle for the imperfect 'he was teaching' 'they were fasting' 'he was in the stern sleeping'. Similarly the construction with the perfect passive participle corresponds closely enough to our 'he was clothed'. Matthew very rarely uses any form of the construction; never with the present participle, except in the few cases he takes over unaltered from Mark, **3**, **10**, **13**, **22**. Luke on the other hand is not averse to it in the rest of his Gospel, but he prunes it away drastically from his Marcan material, leaving it only in the three first cases of his meeting with it, **3**, **5**, **6**.

It might almost be said that this construction with the auxiliary verb is for Mark, as for us, the real imperfect: for his use of the proper imperfect is little, if at all, removed from his use of the aorist. In cases such as ii 27 ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κτλ., or v 30 ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἔλεγεν Τίς μου ἥψατο; it seems quite impossible to read into ἔλεγεν any sense different from that of εἶπεν. When Mark wants to give the continuous sense of the imperfect, he uses ἦν with the present participle: just as when he wants to give another shade of the imperfect, the inchoative sense, 'began to do' a thing, he uses what is in effect another auxiliary verb, as we shall now see.[1]

[1] Both uses, ἦν with present participle and ἤρξατο with present infinitive, reflect Aramaic use, as I learn from the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College, who supplies me with references to G. Dalman *Die Worte Jesu* pp. 28, 21.

ii. *The verb* ἄρχομαι (ἤρξατο ἤρξαντο) *with present infinitive as auxiliary for the imperfect* (*Matthew* 10 *times*, *Mark* 26, *Luke* 18).

1. i 45 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν . . . Matthew omits the verse: Luke has a (roughly parallel) imperfect.

2. ii 23 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες . . . Matthew retains ἤρξαντο: Luke again substitutes an imperfect.

3. iv 1 καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. Both Matthew and Luke omit the phrase.

4. v 17 καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν . . . Both the other Synoptists change into an aorist.

5. v 20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν . . . No parallel in Matthew: Luke substitutes a participle, ἀπῆλθεν κηρύσσων.

6. vi 2 καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ. No parallel in Luke: Matthew gives the imperfect.

7. vi 7 ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο, καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν... No strict parallel in either Synoptist: but for the imperfect ἐδίδου both substitute the aorist ἔδωκεν. Here, and often in Mark, ἤρξατο marks a 'beginning' in the sense of a new departure rather than a continuous process.

8. vi 34 καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά. The whole phrase disappears from both the other accounts: but in the next verse Luke ix 12 has ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν. That is to say, he borrows Mark's ἤρξατο, but transfers it to something to which 'beginning' was strictly appropriate: 'the sun began to get low'.

9. vi 55 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβάττοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν. The whole paragraph is absent from Luke: Matthew substitutes an aorist, προσήνεγκαν.

10. viii 11 καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ. Matthew has an imperfect: Luke has the Q account of the demand for a sign (xi 29), and therefore leaves out Mark's account.

11. viii 31 καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ... Retained by Matthew: Luke has an aorist participle.

12. viii 32 καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. So also Matthew: Luke omits the episode.

13. x 28 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ. In both the other accounts εἶπεν.

14. x 32 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν: just as viii 31, no. 11. Once more both Matthew and Luke have simply εἶπεν.

15. x 41 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν . . . Luke, to save the credit of two leading apostles, omits all personal references in this episode: Matthew leaves the main story untouched, but for ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν substitutes the aorist ἠγανάκτησαν.

16. x 47 (of Bartimaeus) ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν... Very probably

he did begin and go on with repeated cries: but both Matthew and Luke are, as usual, content with an aorist.

17. xi 15 ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας. Matthew again has the aorist: Luke by exception (and so in no. **18**) retains the Marcan phrase.

18. xii 1 καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν Ἀμπελῶνα . . . . Matthew, having just inserted in the Marcan framework the parable of the Two Sons, naturally omits the whole phrase: Luke follows Mark again, as in the last preceding case.

19. xiii 5 ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. As in no. **11**, it is a real commencement of new matter, the eschatological discourse. Notwithstanding, both the other Synoptists prefer to treat our Lord's words simply as an answer to the question put to Him, 'When shall these things be?' and so introduce them with an aorist.

20. xiv 19 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ . . . Matthew retains ἤρξαντο: Luke omits this and the following verse, perhaps because it seemed impossible that any but the actual traitor could have needed to put the question 'Is it I?'

21. xiv 33 ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν. Matthew once more retains ἤρξατο: Luke omits the whole verse.

22. xiv 65 καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ. For this Matthew has an aorist, Luke (better) an imperfect.

23. xiv 69 καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν. For this Matthew has a present tense, Luke an aorist. B and the Sahidic, moved by just the same considerations as the two Evangelists, substitute εἶπεν in St Mark for the characteristic language of the author.

24. xiv 71 ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν. So too Matthew: Luke, not liking to attribute oaths or curses to the apostle, contents himself with the statement of fact 'Peter said'.

25. xv 8 ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι . . . . The verse has nothing corresponding to it in the other two accounts.

26. xv 18 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτόν. Cf. no. **22**: there, as here, Matthew has, instead of ἤρξαντο, an aorist. No parallel in Luke.

Out of these twenty-six instances, there are parallels in Matthew to nineteen, in Luke to fifteen: Matthew gets rid of ἤρξα(ν)το thirteen times, or twice in every three, Luke twelve times, or four times out of every five. As with regard to the substantive verb and participle, so here Matthew is averse to the construction himself, and where he does use it it is more often than not (six times out of ten: see **2**, **11**, **12**, **20**, **21**, **24**) taken over straight from Mark; while conversely Luke is again not so disinclined to the usage on his own account, but leaves it unaltered in Mark less often than Matthew, **17**, **18**, and see on **8**.

iii. *The verb δύναμαι as auxiliary (altogether Matthew 27 times, Mark 33, Luke 26).*

Not only is the verb δύναμαι more common in Mark than in either Matthew or Luke, but in many cases its force is so weakened that it becomes almost an auxiliary verb, and corresponds to our 'can' 'could' or even 'may' 'might'. Translation of this shade of meaning is therefore easy in English, and the Authorized Version uses ordinarily 'can' and 'could', but in iv 32 'may', in xiv 5 'might have been sold', and in iv 33 'as they were able'. In about half the cases of the use of δύναμαι in St Mark, there is nothing remarkable about it, and they will not be cited here: where there are parallels in the other Synoptists, they do not shrink from repeating Mark's phraseology; where, as in the majority of cases, a negative is expressed or implied, we could paraphrase 'it is impossible'. But in the other half Mark's usage of δύναμαι is tending towards an auxiliary sense, and any rendering like 'it is not possible' would exaggerate his meaning: R.V. (though it may be right in substituting 'are able' for the 'can' of A.V. in Mark x 38, 39) goes wrong when it tries to represent the future δυνήσεται (iii 25, viii 4, ix 39) by 'will (shall) be able': for the 'can' of A.V. all that is necessary is to put 'could'.

The cases that follow are those where the weakened or auxiliary use is probable or at least possible.

1. i 45 ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς εἰσελθεῖν. There was no physical impossibility: A.V., R.V., rightly 'could no more'. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

2. iii 20 ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν. No parallels: but cf. Mark vi 31 οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν where the sense is practically the same as in iii 20 'They could not even get a meal'. Again no question of physical impossibility.

3. iii 23, 24, 25, 26 πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; . . . οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι . . . οὐ δυνήσεται στῆναι . . . οὐ δύναται στῆναι. Probably Matthew and Luke take the passage from Q: in any case they avoid the use of δύναμαι right through. (But Matthew follows Mark iii 27 in using it of the entry into the strong man's house.)

4. iv 32 ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν. Matthew retains Mark's construction but substitutes ἐλθεῖν for δύνασθαι: Luke turns the clause into a statement of fact καὶ . . . κατεσκήνωσεν. Q may once more have affected Matthew and Luke: but anyhow they have in fact both avoided Mark's δύνασθαι, which A.V. very well renders 'may'.

5. iv 33 He spoke the word to them in parables καθὼς ἠδύναντο

ἀκούειν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew omits the phrase. A. V. and R.V. 'as they were able to hear it', but I suspect that Mark does not mean more than 'in proportion to their capacity' 'as they could hear'.

6. vi 5 οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν. No parallel: but obviously Mark means that it was a moral impossibility for Christ to work miracles where there was not faith to correspond. Both our versions rightly 'could there do'.

7. vii 15 ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν (cf. *v.* 18). No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes the simple κοινοῖ, because 'can defile' hardly means more here than 'does defile'.

8. ix 39 οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με. 'Could easily revile me' is surely the right shade of the meaning, rather than 'shall be able to' of R.V. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

9. xiv 5 ἠδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι . . . So Matthew: no parallel in Luke. 'Might have been sold' A.V. and R.V., rightly.

10. xiv 7 ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε . . . εὖ ποιῆσαι. Matthew omits: Luke again has no parallel. A.V. 'whensoever ye will ye may do them good' is exactly right: 'can do them good' of R.V. is unnecessary, and 'are able to do them good' would be an exaggeration of emphasis.

Consideration of Mark's use of δύναμαι does not perhaps at first sight compel us to conclusions so clear as those of the two preceding sections of this paper. But it cannot be without significance that Mark uses this verb, in proportion to the length of his Gospel, about twice as often as the other two Synoptists: and that being so, I think it is legitimate to apply the presumption to be drawn from his use of auxiliary verbs in general to this particular case. The parallel of our own language shews us how a verb like 'can' has tended to lose something of its original force: 'can you come to lunch to-morrow?' is intermediate between 'will you come?' and 'are you able to come?' Verbs like ἰσχύω begin to replace the stricter meaning of δύναμαι in later Greek. In Mark ix 18 'I said to thy disciples that they should cast it out' καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν, both the other Synoptists substitute οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν, perhaps from οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν of Mark ix 28. Did the father use a stronger word than the apostles?

iv. *The verb θέλω as auxiliary (altogether Matthew* 39 *times, Mark* 25, *Luke* 28).

Θέλω is even mere definitely an auxiliary in Mark than δύναμαι. It cannot indeed be distinguished from βούλομαι, since the latter word has almost dropped out from the language of the Gospels, and θέλω has replaced it. But θέλω itself hardly expresses the idea of a strong definite wish: for that sense other words have to be found, and θέλω in

Mark can almost always be rendered by our own auxiliary verbs 'will' (in the present tense) and 'would' (in the past). Since, however, we use 'shall' and not 'will' as the auxiliary verb in the first person (singular and plural), the rule does not apply to the forms θέλω θέλομεν: Mark vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῷς μοι is really mistranslated by the 'I will' of both A.V. and R.V.: x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν is better rendered by them 'we would'; 'I want' or 'I should like' would be the most exact equivalents, and so indeed also, though the existing rendering has too sacred associations to be replaced by any other, in xiv 36.

It is interesting to note further how often in Mark the verbs θέλω and δύναμαι, our 'would' and 'could', stand in context and contrast with one another: i 40 ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι, 'If you would, you could make me clean'; vi 19 ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο, 'she would have killed him, but could not' (A.V. is right: R.V. 'desired to kill him' is wrong); vii 24 οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν, 'he would have remained incognito, but could not'; xiv 7 ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς πάντοτε εὖ ποιῆσαι, 'if you would, you could be benefiting them continually'.

That θέλω must not be translated 'wish' or 'desire' in St Mark is made abundantly clear by vi 48 ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς, which of course does not mean 'He desired to pass them by', but exactly what we express by 'He would have passed them by'—if they had not noticed Him and stopped Him.

Now let us take some other passages in order, and see how they fit in with the principles of rendering just enunciated.

iii 13 προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτός. Here we approach nearer than anywhere else in the Gospel to the sense of 'choice', and it is possible that this is just what is suggested by the otherwise inexplicable αὐτός. For obviously it cannot mean 'whom he himself selected and not somebody else', so that R.V.'s 'whom he himself would' is pure nonsense: and though St Mark wrote a Greek of his own and not that of the grammars, he meant something by it. *Faute de mieux*, it may therefore not be too bold to suggest that what he did mean by αὐτός was to add the element of personal choice to the colourless word ἤθελεν, and so for A.V. 'whom he would' I would substitute 'whom he willed'.

vi 26 οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἀθετῆσαι αὐτήν. For 'he would not reject her' I should be inclined to write 'he did not want to reject her'. That is, I think, the best rendering where a negative precedes θέλω.

viii 34 εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν. A.V. is right with 'will come after me', rather than R.V. with 'would come after me'. Note that in the next verse ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ σῶσαι is strictly parallel to ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει—for it will hardly be suggested that a 'will to save life' is contrasted

with an accidental or involuntary loss of it. No instance could shew more clearly that θέλω is *practically* an auxiliary verb, and nothing else. So ix 35, x 43.

ix 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον. Both A.V. and R.V. 'what they listed': that is, in modern English, 'what they liked'. Not 'what they willed'.

x 36 τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; Our authorities vary a good deal in these words, but the reading is borne out by x 51 τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; xiv 12 ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν; xv 9 θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν; and possibly xv 12 τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω; 'What would ye I should do?' or in more modernized English 'What do you want me to do?'[1] The extraordinary reading of ℵ^{c} B Ψ in x 36 τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν; is relegated to the margin of W-H, and must presumably be a conflation between two readings ποιήσω and με ποιῆσαι.

xii 38 τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν. A.V. 'love' is a shade too strong: but it is nearer the mark than R.V. 'desire'. Our exact equivalent is 'like' to walk in their best clothes.

One remaining word, and it is an important one, must be said about the construction θέλω ἵνα.[2] It is found three times in Mark, vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῷς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάνου, ix 30 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ, x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν, where the idiomatic rendering is, I think, 'I want you to give me' 'He did not want any one to know' 'We want you to give us': once apiece in Matthew and Luke but in the same phrase, Matt. vii 12 = Luke vi 31 ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε (καθὼς θέλετε) ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, where perhaps the phrase of Q was already so ingrained in Christain use as not to permit of change: once in John, xvii 24. Now θέλω νά is the modern Greek for the future tense: obviously the κοινή of the first century A.D. was already moving in that direction, and Mark of all the Evangelists most nearly represents the κοινή unaffected by literary tradition. The usage of auxiliary verbs was already beginning to establish itself.

v. *The verb* ἔχω (73 *times in Matthew*, 68 *in Mark*, 76 *in Luke*).

The account of auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs would be incomplete without some treatment of the verb ἔχω, which shares with the words hitherto treated a disproportionate frequency of usage in

[1] In ix 5 the ordinary texts give καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, and Luke too has καὶ ποιήσωμεν: but Matthew has εἰ θέλεις ποιήσω, and whence did he derive εἰ θέλεις, unless he read in Mark either θέλεις ποιήσω with D b ff i, or θέλεις ποιήσωμεν with Θ *fam* 13 565? 'Would you like us to make three tabernacles?'

[2] The use of ἵνα in Mark demands special treatment. It is found 58 times in Mark, as against 33 and 37 times respectively in the longer Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

Mark as compared with Matthew and Luke, though it is not strictly auxiliary. Only in two passages is there anything like an echo of the low-Latin idiom of *habeo* with the past participle passive which has as we know established itself in the languages of Western Euope: iii 1 ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα, viii 17 πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; That does a little bit suggest *arefactam habens manum*, and Matthew and Luke both instinctively substitute the adjective ξηρά for the participle ἐξηραμμένη: they have nothing parallel to viii 17. The papyri and modern Greek, I am told, shew that Greek as well as Latin developed along the lines of the auxiliary use of 'have' with the perfect participle; and that would account for the two instances in Mark.

But Mark's fondness for ἔχειν goes much farther than this, and the tendency of the two other Synoptists, and especially Luke, to modify Mark's language on many of the occasions of its use, is worth recording. I do not propose to examine all, or anything like all, of the sixty-eight instances where ἔχω occurs: any Greek writer, literary or not, will of course be found to make regular use of the word: what is peculiar to Mark is partly just his fondness for it, partly certain characteristic methods of employing it where a better trained writer like Luke will generally avoid it.

1. i 22 ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. So Matthew: but Luke gets rid of ἔχων by writing ἦν ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. In ii 10, iii 15, the same phrase is followed by an infinitive, which makes all the difference.

2. i 32 τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας, cf. i 34, ii 17, vi 55. In classical Greek this would be κακῶς πράσσοντας or κακῶς πάσχοντας: and therefore, though Matthew has no objection to the phrase, Luke avoids it here, though he does not alter it where our Lord is the speaker, ii 17 χρείαν ἔχουσιν . . . ἰατροῦ . . . οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες—probably a proverbial phrase, and for that reason also more difficult of change.

3. ii 19 ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν, cf. xiv 7 πάντοτε τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. In ii 19 both Matthew and Luke omit the phrase, primarily no doubt because it is redundant after ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν. But the use with εἶναι is the use satisfactory to Luke, cf. 1, 5, 9, 13.

4. ii 25 χρείαν ἔσχεν. Omitted by Matthew and Luke, and characteristically Marcan: but quite classical with a genitive following, ii 17, xi 3, xiv 63, and retained on each occasion by both Matthew and Luke.

5. iii 1, 3 ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα (see above, at the top of the page), τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν: on the first of the two occasions Luke vi 6 substitutes ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά, cf. 1, 3. See the next note.

6. iii 10 ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας, cf. iii 22 Βεεζεβοὺλ ἔχει, iii 30 πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, v 15 τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα, vii 25 εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον

αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ix 17 ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἄλαλον. Of these six cases of ἔχειν neither Matthew nor Luke (where they have parallels at all) retain any one. Luke paraphrases with οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ὑπὸ . . . ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν (but in viii 27 he writes ἔχων δαιμόνια), Matthew with κακῶς ἔχοντες, κακῶς δαιμονίζεται, κακῶς πάσχει. Mark's use would seem to be a sort of colloquial idiom, somewhat resembling our own 'a man with an unclean spirit' and the like.

7. iii 29 οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν. Both Matthew and Luke substitute the cognate verb ἀφίεσθαι. Mark's use is very un-Greek—'to have forgiveness' instead of 'to be forgiven'—and no better example of his exaggerated use of ἔχειν could be found.

8. iv 5, 5, 6, 17 οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν. There is nothing wrong in these phrases, but they do illustrate the limitations of Mark's vocabulary and his fondness for an elementary verb like ἔχειν. Precisely similar is his repeated usage, for instance, of ἔρχεσθαι.

9. iv 40 οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν; cf. xi 22 ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ. Again nothing absolutely incorrect, and Matthew has the construction three times, the Epistle of James twice. But common as πίστις is in St Paul's Epistles, ἔχειν πίστιν only occurs three times. Luke viii 25 changes to ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;

10. v 3 τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. Again Luke changes noun with ἔχειν to verb ἔμενεν, viii 27.

11. v 23 ἐσχάτως ἔχει. A colloquial phrase, unique in N. T., and condemned by purists as not found in Attic writers: see Rutherford *The New Phrynichus* p. 481. Both Matthew and Luke alter it.

12. vi 34 ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, 'as sheep without a shepherd', see on 6 above. The phrase is adopted by Matthew in another context, Matt. ix 36. The idea is frequent in O. T., but the LXX (cf. Luke's usage, see on 3 above) always renders οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν (Swete).

13. vi 38, viii 5 πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; Matthew on both occasions has the same construction as Mark: Luke here (no parallel to viii 5) changes once more to the construction with εἶναι, see on 3, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ . . . But in viii 16, 17 ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε (no Lucan parallel), Matthew substitutes ἐλάβομεν, ἐλάβετε.

14. ix 50 ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα. No parallel: but perhaps Matthew's ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς (Matt. v 13) represents the Q form of the same Saying.

15. x 21 ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων χρήματα πολλά, 23 οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες. It is curious that Luke retains the first and third of these contiguous phrases, and changes the second to ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα, while Matthew retains in substance the second (with κτήματα

for χρήματα) but changes the first to πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα and the third to πλούσιος. Obviously the common instinct of both was to modify at some point or another Mark's superabundant use of ἔχειν in this context.

16. xi 13 συκῆν . . . ἔχουσαν φύλλα, 'a fig-tree in leaf' 'with leaves'. Luke omits the whole episode because of its difficulty, Matthew omits ἔχουσαν φύλλα, perhaps simply because the phrase immediately following 'nothing but leaves' sufficiently implies that there were leaves.

17. xii 6 ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν. Both Matthew and Luke reconstruct the phrase, perhaps just in order to get rid of ἔχω in this connexion. A Greek would naturally have written not εἶχεν υἱόν, but ἦν αὐτῷ υἱός.

18. xiv 8 ὃ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν, 'what she could she did'. Luke omits the episode, because he has already given a similar story in vii 37 ff: Matthew omits this sentence, it may be only to get rid of the collocation ἐμὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε· ὃ ἔσχεν . . . But the parallels which Swete quotes from Luke to this use of ἔχω (Luke vii 42, xii 4, xiv 14, Acts iv 14) are not strictly in point, for in each of them a negative precedes, and that makes a real difference.

Nothing was said above of i 38 τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, because this use of the participle of the middle voice is not *in pari materia* with the rest of the passages enumerated, and moreover it is quite good Greek.

APPENDIX

εἰδέναι, γινώσκειν, ἐπιγινώσκειν, substantially identical in sense in Mark.

We are all familiar with the distinction in classical Greek between εἰδέναι 'to know by intuition' and γινώσκω 'to know by experience or learning', or in other words between 'knowing' and 'learning'. But does this distinction exist for St Mark? Does not the process of degeneration of the language of which we have been accumulating evidence extend to these two similar verbs as well?

1. iv 13 οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε; (no parallel in Matthew or Luke).

Both A.V. and R.V. translate both words 'know': but Swete *ad loc.* would draw the ordinary distinction between 'knowledge which comes from intuition or insight' and 'that which is gained by experience or acquaintance'. Our versions are right, if only for the reason that there is no future of εἰδέναι in N. T.: εἰδήσω is only once found (Heb. viii 11), and that in a quotation from the LXX. But if γνώσομαι is used as the future of εἰδέναι—as it certainly appears to be in this passage—a presumption is already created that in Mark at any rate the two verbs are

not really distinguishable. That presumption appears to be borne out in the passages which follow.

2. v 29, 33 ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἴαται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος . . . εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῇ.

Our versions make the distinction of 'felt' and 'knowing': but I do not think there is any justification for this, beyond perhaps the consideration that γινώσκω may tend to be used where the sphere of knowledge, σώματι or πνεύματι, is expressed.

3. xiii 28, 29; 33, 35 γινώσκεται ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν . . . γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις . . . οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός [ἐστιν] . . . οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται.

Here it is not easy to give any other rendering throughout than 'know'. All that can be said is that it is practically a rule with the negative to use οἴδατε rather than γινώσκετε: cf. iv 27, ix 6, x 38, xi 33, xii 24, xiii 32, xiv 40.

4. xii 12 ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν, and xv 10 ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν (where Matthew at any rate thought that ᾔδει was the proper word to use) contrasted with ii 10 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας and xi 32 ἅπαντες γὰρ ᾔδεισαν τὸν Ἰωάνην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. Here I read ᾔδεισαν confidently with D W Θ 565 700 and O. L. including *k*: for (i) the alternative reading εἶχον is easily explained as introduced from Matthew, (ii) ᾔδεισαν suits better than εἶχον with the word ὄντως —you can 'know of a surety', but how can you 'regard of a surety'?

Does Mark mean to distinguish in these two sets of passages between two sorts of knowledge as predicated on these different occasions of Scribes and Pharisees, of Pilate, and of the crowd? I think the words are synonymous.

5. ii 8, v 30, viii 17, xii 15: the participles γνούς, ἐπιγνούς, εἰδώς, as used of our Lord.

ii 8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται . . . For this and the next case see on 2 above.

v 30 καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν . . .

viii 17 καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;

xii 15 ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί με πειράζετε; So B C L Δ Ψ *a k* Vulg. Syriac and Egyptian versions against ἰδών of the rest: and in spite of xii 34 (and xii 28?) the preponderance of authority for εἰδώς here seems decisive.[1]

[1] Even if εἰδώς is not the correct reading in this passage, the participle reappears in v 33 (quoted above) and vi 20 of Herod ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάνην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον. So for the other two verbs cf. vi 54 εὐθὺς ἐπιγνόντες αὐτόν and xv 45 γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος.

It does not seem possible to distinguish any difference of meaning between the three verbs as used of our Lord's knowledge in these four passages. What distinction there is is perhaps one of tense—εἰδώς being the present, γνούς and ἐπιγνούς the aorist: γινώσκων, ἐπιγινώσκων, are not found in Mark. In other words, when Mark wanted to write a present participle, he used that of οἶδα: when he was writing an aorist, he turned to γινώσκω or ἐπιγινώσκω. Just as with οἴδατε and γνώσεσθε, so with εἰδώς and γνούς, we construct the complete paradigm only by the help of the two verbs.

The practical identity of γινώσκω and ἐπιγινώσκω seems to be borne out by a comparison of vi 33 καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί (if we read ἔγνωσαν with B D and *fam.* 1) καὶ πεζῇ . . . συνέδραμον and vi 54 εὐθὺς ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον . . .

C. H. TURNER.

᾿Αγαπητός

A year ago Prof. Souter published in the JOURNAL (Oct. 1926, xxviii 59) a passage of Plutarch illustrating the sense of ἀγαπητός for which I have pleaded in reference to the Gospels. Shortly before the appearance of Prof. Souter's note my friend the late Prof. A. H. Cruickshank, of the University of Durham, had communicated to me another passage from Plutarch where ἀγαπητός is conjoined with μόνος in the same sense: *de genio Socratis* 27[1] (Charon talking of his son) οὗτος (εἶπεν) ὦ ἄνδρες ἐμοὶ μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαπητός, ὡς ἴστε.

C. H. TURNER.

THE 'SHORTER TEXT' OF ST LUKE XXII 15–20.

IN one of the Additional Notes to *Can we then Believe?* Dr Gore deals with the problem of the 'shorter text' of St Luke's account of the Institution of the Eucharist. In this note the writer, with characteristic candour, records his abandonment of 'a preference for the longer text, as it is found in the A.V. and R.V.', and admits the force of the textual argument against that longer text, as presented by Dr Hort and Dr Sanday. But he still finds the problem of this passage insoluble. The shorter text appears to hold the field, yet 'on the other hand, it is difficult to suppose that St Luke should have been content to give an account of the Institution which ends so abruptly, and leaves it to be supposed that our Lord dealt with the cup before

[1] In the Teubner edition of the *Moralia*, iii 539.

I conclude by an extract from a letter Dom Connolly wrote to me while this paper was being prepared. He says:

'As to the antiquity of the Homily there is a point worth noting, which I have just indicated at the end of my Introduction (p. xli, note 4): "The mere fact that A [Homily xvii, discussed in this paper] treats only of the *missa fidelium* strikes me as a note of antiquity". What I meant was (though this only occurred to me at the last moment) that the Homilies A, B, C, are really *catechetical instructions* like those of Cyril of Jerusalem—and indeed all three of them seem to shew acquaintance with Cyril's Catecheses (see p. 28, note 4; p. 38, note 1; p. 51, note 2).

'In A (Hom. xvii) the author is, I believe, addressing those who have just witnessed the Mysteries for the first time. They had seen all the earlier part as catechumens often before, and so he has nothing to say about it, but begins with the dismissal of the unbaptized and non-communicants. Later people, like "George of Arbel" (cf. also George of the Arab Tribes, and Bar Kepha), go through the whole from beginning to end, but the Catechists don't. They only deal first with baptism and then with the "Mysteries" or central part of the Mass. Such instructions were absolutely necessary, as nothing could be said about the "Mysteries" during the time of catechumenate. Hence all such—Cyril's, Ambrose's, the *De Sacramentis*—have this limitation of scope.'

The conclusion is, that our Homily was composed while the Catechumenate was still a living institution.

F. C. BURKITT.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

IX. *Lexical notes on* (1) *some* ἅπαξ λεγόμενα: *words used once in Mark, and nowhere else in the Gospels*: (2) *some words or phrases of common occurrence in Mark but rare in Matthew or Luke.*[1]

(1)

ἀποστερεῖν.

MARK x 19 μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. The word occurs among the list of the Commandments, and is clearly intended to be one of them: but because it does not in terms correspond to the Old Testament lists, it is dropped by both Matthew and Luke. It is quite certainly genuine,

[1] The notes that follow are rather miscellaneous in character, but I hope that they may be found to present not a few points of interest.

and is indeed presumably the source of the inclusion of 'fraud' among irremissible sins in the penitential discipline of the early Western Church. If μὴ πορνεύσῃς (after μὴ μοιχεύσῃς) at the beginning of the Marcan list is, as I suspect, genuine, then just as the Seventh Commandment is extended to include fornication, so here we may suppose the Eighth is extended to include fraud as well as literal theft.

For the use of ἀποστερεῖν in non-Christian writers I need do no more than refer to Field's admirable note *ad loc.* (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* p. 33): its technical meaning is that of holding back 'money or goods deposited with another for safe keeping'. But it is, I think, worth while to add some references from Christian writers, or in one case from a non-Christian writer in relation to Christian ethics; and with that object I begin by shewing that the earliest Latin rendering of ἀποστερεῖν is *abnegare*.

Mark x 19 'ne abnegaueris' *k*, 'non abnegabis' *a c*. Hermas *Mand.* iii 2 ἀποστερηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, lat. 'abnegant Dominum': *Mand.* viii 5 ἀποστέρησις, lat. 'ab abnegantia'. We can therefore confidently assume that where we find 'abnegare' in an appropriate context, it corresponds to ἀποστερεῖν.

Pliny *ep. ad Traianum* 96 (Lightfoot *S. Ignatius* i 50–53: the well-known letter about the Christians) 'seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent'.

Hermas *Mand.* iii 2 οἱ οὖν ψευδόμενοι ἀθετοῦσι τὸν Κύριον, καὶ γίνονται ἀποστερηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, μὴ παραδίδοντες αὐτῷ τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἣν ἔλαβον. ἔλαβον γὰρ πνεῦμα ἄψευστον· τοῦτο ἐὰν ψευδὲς ἀποδώσωσιν, ἐμίαναν τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀποστερηταί.

Id. *Mand.* viii 5 καί γε πολλά, φησίν, ἔστιν ἀφ' ὧν δεῖ τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγκρατεύεσθαι· κλέμμα, ψεῦσμα, ἀποστέρησις, ψευδομαρτυρία, πλεονεξία κτλ.

Id. *Sim.* vi 5. 5 ὁ ὀξύχολος . . . καὶ ὁ μοιχὸς καὶ ὁ μέθυσος καὶ ὁ κατάλαλος καὶ ὁ ψεύστης καὶ ὁ πλεονέκτης καὶ ὁ ἀποστερητὴς καὶ ὁ τούτοις τὰ ὅμοια ποιῶν κτλ.

Cyprian *ep.* lii 1 (Hartel 617. 1) 'Nicostratum quoque diaconio sanctae administrationis amisso, ecclesiasticis pecuniis sacrilega fraude subtractis et uiduarum ac pupillorum depositis denegatis . . .'

κεφαλιόω.

Mark xii 4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον ἐκεφαλίωσαν καὶ ἠτίμασαν.

Our authorities vary between ἐκεφαλίωσαν (ℵ B L Ψ) and ἐκεφαλαίωσαν (A C D Θ etc.): κεφαλιόω is not given in Liddell and Scott, κεφαλαιόω

only—apart from this passage in Mark—in the sense 'to sum up'. The earliest Latin rendering is 'decollauerunt' *k*: but the injury implied must be something between the ἔδειραν of verse 3 and the ἀπέκτειναν of verse 5, and it must be on the same plane with ἠτίμασαν: in other words, it must be some sort of treatment which would degrade a man, or at any rate make him look ridiculous. I do not see that to 'knock on the head', even if we could get that sense out of the Greek word, which is all but impossible, satisfies this condition: and I see no alternative but conjectural emendation. Burkitt proposes ἐκολάφισαν: but how is 'slapped' a worse form of punishment than 'thrashed'? and why should a fairly familiar word have suffered so gross a corruption? Very tentatively I suggest, that a metathesis of the syllables κε and φα has taken place, such as might occur with an unfamiliar word, and that we should read ἐφακελίωσαν (or ἐφακέλωσαν), 'trussed him up in a bundle'. φάκελος is a classical word, and the verbal form φακελόω is quoted in L. S. from the Byzantine writer Nicetas. I notice too in Thumb that φακιόλι is modern Greek for a turban. If this were the true reading, the procedure indicated would be preparatory to some degrading process expressed by ἠτίμασαν.

προδοῦναι.

Mark xiv 10 ἵνα αὐτὸν προδοῖ (*or* προδοῖ αὐτὸν) αὐτοῖς is the reading of D *c i k* vulg (proderet), where the other texts have the verb elsewhere always used in the Gospels, παραδοῖ (traderet). In the next verse πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδοῖ stands without variant. I suspect that the Western reading in verse 10 is correct. The contrast between προδοῖ and παραδοῖ is very much to the point, προδοῦναι meaning 'to betray', παραδοῦναι properly to 'hand over', 'deliver up' to the chief priests. And it seems much more likely that the normal παραδοῦναι should be introduced by scribes and editors in place of the unusual word, than that the unusual word should have been, on this one occasion, introduced at all.

On the assumption then that προδοῖ is genuine, it will be, with Luke vi 16 Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριὼθ ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης, the only New Testament source of any usage of προδοῦναι προδότης, *prodere proditor*, in early Greek and Latin Christian literature. But while *proditor* is good Latin enough, there is no noun παραδότης in Greek, and therefore προδότης was inevitable (as well as προδοσία), but for the verb παραδοῦναι *tradere* is so all but universal in the Gospels in connexion with Judas that any evidence for the use of the alternative word in Christian antiquity seems worth collecting.

Martyrium Polycarpi vi 1, 2 ὁ εἰρήναρχος ὁ κεκληρωμένος τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα, Ἡρώδης ἐπιλεγόμενος, ἔσπευδεν εἰς τὸ στάδιον αὐτὸν εἰσαγαγεῖν· ἵνα ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὸν ἴδιον κλῆρον ἀπαρτίσῃ Χριστοῦ κοινωνὸς γενόμενος, οἱ δὲ προδόντες αὐτὸν τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὑπόσχοιεν τιμωρίαν.

But this single example of προδοῦναι[1] refers primarily to the betrayal of Polycarp by a domestic rather than to the betrayal of Christ by Judas. One cannot therefore, on the evidence so far available, establish any influence of the solitary instance of προδοῦναι in St Mark, even if it is genuine, on Greek Christian usage.

The case for *prodere* in Latin is more respectable. It is of course clear that προδοῖ in Mark xiv 10, whether or no it is original, was the word rendered by the earliest Latin version: and the two writers now to be cited may or may not have derived their use of *prodere* from its use in this one instance in their Latin Gospels.

Cyprian *de eccl. unit.* 22 (Hartel, 229. 23) 'nam et Iudam inter apostolos Dominus elegit, et tamen Dominum Iudas postmodum prodidit [prodidit R M* prodit G tradidit W M²]. non tamen idcirco apostolorum firmitas et fides cecidit quia proditor Iudas ab eorum societate defecit'.

Id. *ep.* lix 2 (668. 2) 'cum uideamus ipsum Dominum . . . ab eo quem inter apostolos ipse delegerat proditum'.

Ps.-Cypr. *ad Nouatianum* 14 (Hartel, iii 64. 20) 'Iudas ille inter apostolos electus . . . ipse postmodum deum prodidit'.

Proditor occurs also in Iren. lat. I xxviii 9 [xxxi 1] and II xxxii 3 [xx 5], but in the latter passage *traditor* two lines farther on: and in ps.-Tert. *adv. omn. haer.* 2. But as with προδότης this does not perhaps take us very far; though in Latin *traditor* was a possible (and presumably the usual) equivalent for 'the traitor'.

πυγμῇ.

vii 3 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν. Beyond question πυγμῇ stands rightly in the text: so all Greek MSS except ℵ W: but the word was unfamiliar, as the varieties in rendering shew—the Sinai Syriac omits, while of the Latins *a* has momento, *b* subinde, *d* primo, *c ff i* (more correctly) pugillo—and ℵ (followed, as so often, by Jerome in the Vulgate) W emend to πυκνά, crebro. But no one would have thought of altering a known word giving apparently (though not really) a suitable sense to anything as obscure as πυγμῇ. Now πυγμή means 'fist'; but it was also used as a measure of length 'from the fist to the elbow', and the Greek commentators Euthymius and Theophylact in fact interpret it here to mean

[1] I owe it to the kindness of Dr Darwell Stone, editor of the Lexicon of Patristic Greek.

thrusting the arm into the water up to the elbow (Swete). More than twenty years ago I called attention in this JOURNAL (vi 353), when reviewing Dom Butler's edition of the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, to the phrase in chapter lv, p. 148, l. 21, νίψασθαι τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας πυγμῇ ὕδατι ψυχροτάτῳ. A certain young deacon Jovinus was a member of a party travelling from Jerusalem to Egypt, and one very hot day on arriving at their destination he got a washing-tub and plunged hands and feet πυγμῇ into ice-cold water. Whereupon an elderly lady of the party rebuked him for self-indulgence in so pampering himself in his youth: she herself, though in the sixtieth year of her age, never washed anything ἐκτὸς τῶν ἄκρων τῶν χειρῶν. Since χείρ in Greek means properly the forearm, τὰ ἄκρα τῶν χειρῶν may mean 'the fingers' or even as much as 'the hands' in the modern sense of the word, but not more: and in contrast with this, Jovinus' washing must clearly have been 'up to the elbow'. That gives excellent sense also to the passage in Mark, and justifies the exegesis of Euthymius and Theophylact. We learn once more the value of the Greek Fathers, even the latest of them, as interpreters of the New Testament.

(2)

ἀλλά (*Mark* 46 *times*, *Matthew* 37 *times*, *Luke* 36 *times*).

Obviously from these numbers the particle is a special favourite of Mark's: but obviously also there will be many instances where its use is normal, and offered no temptation to change. There are however some ten instances where Matthew does, apparently with intention, substitute another word, generally δέ: though as it happens in only three of these (**3**, **8**, **9**) have we a real parallel in Luke.

1. ix 8 οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον: so A C L W Δ Θ 565 sah. arm. Matt. xvii 8 οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον. In Mark ℵ B D have introduced εἰ μή from Matthew, but the Latins should not be quoted on this side, for they could hardly help rendering ἀλλά in this context by 'neminem nisi'—I suspect indeed that the εἰ μή of D may be due to assimilation to the 'nisi' of its Latin column. It is in the last degree unlikely that any scribe should have altered εἰ μή to the ungrammatical ἀλλά, while the converse change, supported by the parallel in Matthew, would be easy enough. Mark's usage is probably influenced by Aramaic, but Moulton-Milligan in their *Vocabulary of N.T.* cite from the papyri a close parallel μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλίσκῳ γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλὰ Ἀπωλλωνίαν.

2. ix 13 ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν. Matt. xvii 12 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν.

3 xi 32 ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; Matt. xxi 26, Luke xx 6, ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων . . .

4. xiii 20 οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς . . . Matt. xxiv 22 διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς . . .

5. xiii 24 ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην . . . Matt. xxiv 29 εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων . . .

6. xiv 28 ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Matt. xxvi 32 μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με . . .

7. xiv 29 εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. Matt. xxvi 33 omits the ἀλλά, and writes εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι.

8. xiv 36 παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σύ. Matt. xxvi 39, Luke xxii 42, agree in substituting πλὴν for ἀλλά 1°, possibly to avoid the double ἀλλά of Mark.

9. xiv 49 ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. The sentence is of course incomplete: Matt. xxvi 56 completes it by dropping ἀλλά and substituting τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν. Luke xxii 53 on the other hand retains ἀλλά but gives it a full construction, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα . . .

10. xvi 7 ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ . . . Matthew once more drops ἀλλά, xxviii 7 καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε . . .

(πρὸς) ἑαυτούς.

(*Mark has* πρὸς ἑαυτούς *seven times*, πρὸς ἀλλήλους *four times*: *Luke* πρὸς ἑαυτούς *twice*, πρὸς ἀλλήλους *eight times*: *John* πρὸς ἑαυτούς *twice*, πρὸς ἀλλήλους *four times*: *Matthew never uses either phrase*.)

There is of course no doubt about the meaning of πρὸς ἀλλήλους (Mark iv 41, viii 16, ix 34, xv 31): the problem to be resolved is the meaning of πρὸς ἑαυτούς.

1. i 27 ὥστε συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας . . . I read πρὸς ἑαυτούς with A C D Θ W (αὐτούς 565) and Marcan usage, cf. 3 below: syr-sin 'to one another': αὐτούς ℵ B Tisch. W-H. I do not doubt that Alexandrian scholars disliked the phrase πρὸς ἑαυτούς if it was used—as συνζητεῖν shews it was here used—to mean 'with one another'. Luke's συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους shews that he had πρὸς ἑαυτούς, not αὐτούς, before him in Mark. There is no parallel in Matthew.

2. ix 10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συνζητοῦντες τί ἐστιν . . . The parallel of 1 suggests that, in spite of the unusual order of the words, πρὸς ἑαυτούς must be taken with συνζητοῦντες, 'discussing with one another': for the absolute use of τὸν λόγον κρατεῖν 'keep in mind', cf. vii 3, 4, 8, 'observe the tradition'. There is no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.

3. x 26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς . . . Once more the Alexandrians avoided πρὸς ἑαυτούς, substituting πρὸς αὐτόν: so

ℵ B C Δ Ψ and the Egyptian versions with W-H, against A D W latt. syr-sin and all other authorities with Tisch. But Mark's usage is quite decisive, for λέγειν πρὸς αὐτόν is never found in his Gospel, but always λέγειν αὐτῷ. Both Matthew and Luke have simply λέγοντες (εἶπαν).

4. xi 31 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες . . . Here Matthew alters to παρ' ἑαυτοῖς 'among themselves', and Luke, while retaining πρὸς ἑαυτούς, alters the verb to συνελογίσαντο, Luc. xx 5, compare xxii 23 συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτούς.

5. xii 7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι . . . Again Matthew alters to εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς . . ., Luke to διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες . . . Luke, as in 1, clearly understood Mark to mean 'said to one another'.

6. xiv 4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς . . . Textual complications abound in this passage, and the usual conditions are reversed, for the Alexandrians and the mass of authorities with W syr-sin give πρὸς ἑαυτούς, while D Θ 565 *c ff i k* omit πρὸς ἑαυτούς with Matthew (there is no parallel in Luke): but again Marcan usage must be the decisive factor.

7. xvi 3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς Τίς ἀποκυλίσει . . . Neither Matthew nor Luke has anything parallel here.

Πρὸς ἑαυτούς 'with one another' is thus a Marcan usage, which Luke generally modifies, Matthew absolutely rejects. But Luke, wherever he is parallel to Mark, always retains the sense: it is a more difficult question whether Matthew, when he substitutes παρ' ἑαυτοῖς (4 above), or ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (5 above, and similarly for πρὸς ἀλλήλους of Mark viii 16), means the same thing as Mark or no, since ἐν ἑαυτοῖς might mean, what ἐν ἑαυτῷ must mean (Matt. ix 21, Mark v 30, Luke vii 39, xii 17, xvi 3, xviii 4), 'in their own hearts'.

ἐκ, ἀπό.

(*Mark has ἐκ half as often again as ἀπό; Matthew and Luke have ἀπό rather more frequently than ἐκ; John has ἐκ more than three times as often as ἀπό. The actual numbers for ἐκ are roughly Mark* 66, *Matthew* 82, *Luke* 87.)

On many occasions of course the other Synoptists take no offence at Mark's use of ἐκ: but some phrases they omit, and further in something over a dozen cases ἐκ of Mark is changed to ἀπό in one or both of them. Since ἐκ has given way to ἀπό in modern Greek, it does not seem likely that we can appeal to the κοινή to explain the preponderant use of ἐκ in Mark and John: and we seem thrown back on the Semitic atmosphere of the two Gospels.

1. i 10 ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος. Matthew ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος: no parallel in Luke.

2, 3. i 25, 26 ἔξελθε. ἐξ αὐτοῦ [ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] . . . ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Luke ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ . . . ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. The whole episode is absent from Matthew: but compare 9 below.

4. i 29 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες. Luke ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς: no parallel in Matthew.

5. v 8 ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ Ἔξελθε . . . ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Luke παρήγγελλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Matthew abbreviates at this point and omits the whole verse.

6. vi 14 ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν. Luke retains ἐκ, doubtless because in the phrase 'rose again from the dead' ἐκ νεκρῶν was almost universal (so Luke, John, Acts, Pauline epistles, Hebrews, 1 Peter): Matthew is the only N.T. writer who even here prefers ἀπό, ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν xiv 2, cf. xxvii 64, xxviii 7 (xvii 9 *b* is the only exception).

7. ix 9 *a* καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους. So I read with B D 33 (and 'de monte' of latt. perhaps suggests ἐκ rather than ἀπό) W-H: if with the rest we read ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους the explanation of the preposition may be that ἐκ νεκρῶν follows immediately after. Luke κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους: in Matt. xvii 9 *a* ℵ B C D W Θ and others agree with the ἐκ of Mark, and it is possible that the Lucan parallel is responsible for the intrusion of ἀπό into the majority of MSS of both Matthew and Mark. Of course ἀπό is the natural preposition to use with καταβαίνειν: so Matt. viii 1, xiv 29, xxvii 40, 42, Mark iii 22, xv 30, 32, Luke ix 54, x 30, Acts viii 26, xxv 7, 1 Thess. iv 6. The Gospel of John and the Apocalypse are alone in writing regularly καταβαίνειν ἐκ.

8. ix 17 εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου. Matthew ἄνθρωπος: Luke ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου.

9. ix 25 ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Matthew ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ: no parallel in Luke. Conversely the same phrase in 2, 3, 5, is altered to ἀπό in Luke, while there is no parallel in Matthew.

10. xi 8 στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν δένδρων. Matthew ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων. Luke omits the clause.

11. xiii 1 καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Matthew ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ: the whole clause is dropped by Luke.

12. xiv 25 οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου. So in effect Matthew: but Luke ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

13. xvi 3 τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου Luke εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου. No parallel in Matthew.

πάλιν (*Mark* 27 *times*, *Matthew* 16 *times*, *Luke thrice*, *John* 43 *times*).

The mere enumeration of these numbers creates at once the suspicion that the preponderant use of the word in Mark and John, coupled with its practical absence from Luke, must be due *either* to the Aramaic background of the thought of the second and fourth evangelists, *or* to some characteristic of the Κοινή instinctively repugnant to the other two and especially to Luke. I do not propose here to choose between these two alternatives (they are not indeed mutually exclusive), but I confine myself to the investigation of the meaning or meanings of the word in Mark and of the procedure of the other two Synoptists when they found the word before them. But the caution must be given *in limine* that since Mark most commonly uses πάλιν in cases of transition—as we should put it, at the beginning of a paragraph—and since it is just these introductory phrases which Matthew and Luke habitually drop in copying Mark, the proportion of cases where there is no actual parallelism between the three is much smaller than the numbers at first sight suggest. In fact out of the twenty-seven instances in Mark, there are only nineteen where Matthew is strictly parallel, and for Luke only nine. Even so, the results are startling enough: Matthew retains πάλιν five times—twice with some modification—Luke retains it once.

Before giving the catalogue of the instances of πάλιν in Mark, it may be well to deal with, and dismiss, those cases where the textual evidence is divided for or against πάλιν. They are not many, and for the most part they reflect simply the same tendency, on the part of ancient scribes or editors, to dislike the word and therefore to remove it, which influenced Matthew and to a still greater degree Luke But the textual problem is rather more complicated when it is a question of the place of πάλιν in the sentence, though it is probably a good general rule for Mark that in case of doubt the earlier place is the more likely to be genuine.

The most definite result that emerges is the bad record of the Textus Receptus: in vii 14 it substitutes πάντα τὸν ὄχλον for πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον, in viii 1 παμπολλοῦ ὄχλου for πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου, in xi 3 it omits πάλιν entirely. and, as represented by cod. A, also in x 24; while in viii 13 and xiv 40 it moves πάλιν to a later position in the sentence. But again the record of the Western text is not wholly satisfactory, though it must of course not be forgotten, so far as the Latin witnesses are concerned, that either omission or transposition of so apparently unimportant a word may take place in the process of rendering into

the vernacular, whatever was the form of the Greek before the translator: for omission compare ii 13 (D[gr], *fam* 13?), viii 13 (*b c*), x 1 (W *fam* 13 *b c ff i*), xi 3 (W 565 syr. sin. latt.), xiv 40 (D W *a c ff k*), for transposition iv 1 ἤρξατο πάλιν and v 21 εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν (D 565 O.L., with the support on the second occasion of ℵ and on the first of W). On the other hand in ii 1 πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν of latt. (W) is a transposition in the right direction, and in xiv 69 πάλιν ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη of D Θ 565 *c k* syr. sin. I believe to be right against the rest. The solitary instance of a serious discrepancy in text is xiv 40, where πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτούς of ℵ B L (so syr-sin, but with πάλιν after αὐτούς, and D and O.L., but without πάλιν) must unquestionably be right against the ὑποστρέψας of W Θ 565 vulg. and the mass of Greek authorities, since ὑποστρέφω, while common in Luke and Acts, is never found (apart from this passage) in Matthew, Mark, or John: it is just an attempt to vary the construction of xiv 40 from that of xiv 39.

1. ii 1 καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναούμ . . . 'Again', with reference back to i 39 καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Matthew omits πάλιν: Luke is not parallel.

2. ii 13 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. 'And he left Capernaum again for the lake-side', with reference to ii 1. Πάλιν omitted by Luke: Matthew not parallel.

3. iii 1 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγήν. Πάλιν omitted by both the others: in Mark are we to interpret 'again', 'once more', with possibly a reference to i 21, 39? or if that is too distant, are we forced to render πάλιν by something like 'next'?

4. iii 20 καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν [ὁ] ὄχλος. 'And again a [the] crowd collects': we can quite easily refer back, if need be, to iii 9 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. No parallels in the other Synoptists.

5. iv 1 καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. The lake-side had been mentioned in iii 7, and teaching by the lake-side in ii 13. But with each recurrence of πάλιν the impression seems to become clearer that Mark has not really got these elaborate cross-references in his mind, the more so that πάλιν, as the story proceeds, comes more frequently at the beginning of the sentence, and so corresponds more closely to our English use of 'Again' in the same position. Omitted by Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

6. v 21 καὶ διαπεράσαντος . . . πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Here the idiomatic rendering would certainly be 'back to the other side': and viii 13, x 10, x 32, xi 3, xi 27, xiv 39, 40, are also cases, where with verbs of motion, the same word 'back' may not be the right one. It appears to be the only meaning of πάλιν in Homer. Luke omits: no parallel in Matthew.

7. vii 14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον. 'And summoning the

crowd again.' The right rule for securing the equivalent sense in English seems to be to put 'again' into the most inconspicuous place. 'Once more' is certainly reading too much into Mark. Matthew omits: Luke is deficient as far as 11 inclusive.

8. vii 31 καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν. Omitted by Matthew. Conceivably we should render 'and on the return, leaving the district of Tyre, he came'.

9. viii 1 ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος. It is here more attractive to see a definite intention to hark back to the other miracle of feeding, vi 34 εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον, and if so we must render 'there was again a great crowd', in the sense of 'once more'. Matthew has just mentioned 'crowds' twice over as present, and so omits the whole verse.

10. viii 13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Here again, comparing verse 10 ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, we must apparently render 'embarked again and went away to the other side'. Matthew again omits the word.

11. viii 25 εἶτα πάλιν [ἐπ]έθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ. Πάλιν obviously here refers back to the first imposition of hands in verse 23, 'again' in the sense of a second time, cf. xiv 39, 40, 69, 70. The whole story is absent from Matthew.

12, 13. x 1 συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος (for the reading see on [συν]-πορεύεσθαι below) πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς It is worth noting that the combination of 'crowd' and 'teaching' does occur before in vi 34; but the interval is so great that we can hardly suppose a direct reference, and must fall back on the indefinite 'again'. In neither clause does πάλιν reappear in Matthew: there is no parallel in Luke.

14. x 10 καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. It is very tempting to render 'and when they were back in the house his disciples asked him about it': see **6** above. Again no parallel in Luke: omission of the whole verse in Matthew.

15. x 24 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει. Here the reference to verse 23 seems clear, 'but Jesus repeated his statement', 'said once more'. Luke omits the verse, no doubt because it is a repetition: Matthew, to avoid any break in our Lord's words, ingeniously alters to πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν.

16. x 32 καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, 'taking the twelve back into company with him', because He had been walking on alone in front. See again **6** above.

17. xi 3 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν πάλιν ὧδε. If (as I think) these words are part of the message the two disciples were to deliver, we could render 'The Lord needs the colt, and will send back again here

(i. e. to the place from which it was taken) as soon as ever he has done with him'. The clause is omitted by Luke, the word by Matthew.

18. xi 27 καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Comparing verse 19 'they left the city', I should once more render 'they come back to Jerusalem'. Both the other evangelists omit the whole sentence.

19. xii 4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον. The reference is to the first sending of a servant in verse 2, 'and again he sent them a second servant'. Matthew retains πάλιν, Luke retains the idea but avoids the word by προσέθετο πέμψαι.

20, 21. xiv 39, 40 (καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν . . . καὶ ἔρχεται . . .) καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν . . . καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν . . . It seems impossible here not to translate 'he went forward [*v.* 35] . . . and he came and found them asleep [*v.* 37] . . . and a second time he went away [*v.* 39] . . . and a second time he came and found them asleep [*v.* 40] . . . [Mark leaves us to understand the third departure, which Matthew supplies, xxvi 44 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθών] . . . and he came the third time and said unto them'. πάλιν . . . τὸ τρίτον correspond, that is, to one another: Matthew makes this still clearer by writing πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου . . . ἐκ τρίτου. But Mark is content with the less emphatic πάλιν: it is only when the second time is important as such that he writes in xiv 72 εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. Luke has no parallel: Matthew to the double use of πάλιν in Mark adds a third of his own.

22. xiv 61 καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν: referring to a previous ἐπηρώτησεν of *v.* 60, cf. **26**. Matthew omits: Luke is not parallel.

23, 24, 25. xiv 69, 70 [ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν . . . καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον . . . λέγει . . . ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο λέγων . . .] πάλιν ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη ἤρξατο λέγειν . . . ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον . . . Here we have, as in **21, 22,** πάλιν for the second assertion and the second denial, but, in contrast to that passage, also of the third assertion. Of the three cases of πάλιν Luke retains none, Matthew only the second.

26. xv 4 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, referring to *v.* 2 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πειλᾶτος. 'Questioned him again', exactly as in **22.** No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes his favourite τότε.

27. xv 12 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, referring back (as in **22** and **26**) to a previous contact of the same interlocutors, *v.* 9 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων.

28. xv 13 οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. A difficulty is raised (see Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v.) by Souter, on the ground presumably that the crowd had not been said to have made the cry before. But it must be remembered that in the case of the high priest, and both times in the case of Pilate—**22, 26, 27**—Mark's πάλιν does not imply that the same question or statement was repeated, but only

that 'he questioned him again' or 'he made answer to them again'. And we may well suppose that possibly *v.* 8 and more certainly *v.* 11 implies a previous ἔκραξαν on the part of the crowd. Luke at least so interpreted the words of *v.* 11 ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς, for he writes in xxiii 18 ἀνέκραγον δὲ παμπληθεὶ λέγοντες· Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Βαραββᾶν.

What are the general results of this perhaps over long and over detailed enquiry? Primarily, I think, that πάλιν is in Mark a very light and unemphatic particle: and secondly that the original sense of 'back' seems clear in certain connexions, e. g. **6**, **17**, and possible in **8**, **14**, **16**, **18**. The vehement dislike of Luke for the word I should suppose to be due exactly to his Hellenic sense of the importance of definiteness and precision in the use of particles. In the first five instances of the list just given πάλιν is really almost otiose as used by Mark.

ὑπάγω and πορεύεσθαι (with its compounds).

A. ὑπάγω.

(*Mark* 15 *times*, *Matthew* 19 *times*, *Luke* 5 *times*, *John* 32 *times*, *Apocalypse* 6 *times*: *not in Acts*, *Paul*, *or Hebrews*.)

The first distinction that needs drawing about ὑπάγω is between its use in the imperative and its use in other moods: for while Matthew (17 times out of 19) and Mark (12 times out of 15) use it almost exclusively in the imperative, this was exactly what Luke most disliked. The imperative is found only twice in Luke, four times in John, and twice in the Apocalypse.

Imperative.

1. i 44 ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ. So Matthew: Luke ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον . . .

[ii 9 καὶ ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε ℵ L Δ Tisch (and with the addition εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου D 33 *a ff* arm.: this is perhaps the earlier form of the corruption) is certainly wrong, and has come in from *v.* 11. περιπάτει must be read with A B C W Θ 565 *b c e* vulg. sah.: and so Matthew and Luke.]

2. ii 11 καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. So Matthew: Luke πορεύου . . .

3. v 19 Ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. Absent from Matthew: Luke ὑπόστρεφε . . .

4. v 34 Ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην. Again no parallel in Matthew: πορεύου Luke.

5. vi 38 Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε. Matthew drops the verse: Luke recasts, using πορευθέντες.

6. vii 29 Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὕπαγε. Matthew recasts: Luke is defective.

7. viii 33 Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. So Matthew: Luke omits the episode.

8. x 21 Ὕπαγε ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον. Matthew retains ὕπαγε, Luke omits it.

9. x 52 Ὕπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. Luke changes ὕπαγε to ἀνάβλεψον, Matthew omits the whole clause.

10. xi 2 Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν. Here the usual conditions are reversed, for Matthew changes to πορεύεσθε, Luke on this one occasion retains ὑπάγετε.

11. xiv 13 Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν. So Matthew: Luke εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς . . .

12. xvi 7 ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε, εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Matthew substitutes πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε, Luke omits the charge to deliver a message, probably because of the reference to Galilee.

Other moods (*participle and indicative*).

13. vi 31 ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί. Not in Matthew or Luke.

14. vi 33 καὶ εἶδαν αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας. Again not in either Matthew or Luke.

15. xiv 21 ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει. So Matthew: Luke πορεύεται.

On the whole then Matthew retains Mark's imperatives 5/7, but substitutes πορεύεσθε (πορευθεῖσαι) 2/7: in the other moods he retains ὑπάγειν only once, xiv 21 = Matt. xxvi 24. Luke never retains any form of the verb where he finds it in Mark, save only xi 2 = Luke xix 30: four times he substitutes πορεύεσθαι, once ὑποστρέφειν, and twice uses the participles ἀπελθών, εἰσελθόντων. It seems not unusual with Luke to deal more drastically than in the rest of his Gospel with a word which he finds often, and dislikes, in Mark.

ὑπάγειν must have been a κοινή use, and appears to survive in modern Greek (Blass *Grammatik des N.T. Griechisch* § 24 s. v.). The use probably had its origin in the want of a word to express 'go' as contrasted with 'come' (Mark vi 31 οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες is exactly our 'coming and going'), and for this purpose it is more expressive than the alternative πορεύεσθαι. Further it seems not unlikely that the colloquial imperative ὕπαγε 'go' is an echo of the similar, quite classical, ἄγε 'come': though it is not clear why the particular compound ὕπαγε was employed for the purpose.

B. **πορεύεσθαι** and its compounds.

πορεύεσθαι (Matthew 28 times, Luke 50 times: never in Mark).

[Mc. ix 30 κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες ἐπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας B D *c* W-H text. παρεπορεύοντο the rest, and Marcan usage—see below on παραπορεύεσθαι—is decisive in favour of this reading. 'Iter faciebant' of *a* should not be cited (as by Tischendorf) on the side of the simple verb: it would be an excellent rendering of παραπορεύεσθαι.]

In Luke πορεύεσθαι is three times substituted for ἀπελθεῖν of Mark, four times for ὑπάγειν of Mark.

διαπορεύεσθαι (Luke thrice: not Matthew or Mark at all).

[Mc. ii 23 καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν διαπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων B C D W-H text: πορεύεσθαι W: παραπορεύεσθαι the rest, according to Marcan usage. διαπορεύεσθαι has clearly come in from Luke.]

ἐκπορεύεσθαι (Mark eleven times, Matthew four times [Mt. xvii 21 is not genuine], Luke three times).

Matthew twice substitutes the simple verb, twice ἐξέρχεσθαι, once ἐκβάλλεσθαι. Luke generally omits. Note that Mark three times uses the word in the genitive absolute of the present participle, ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ, of our Lord's movements: x 17, x 46, xiii 1.

παραπορεύεσθαι (Mark four times, Matthew once, copying Mc. xv 29, Luke never).

Apparently the compound verb παραπορεύεσθαι must have been unfamiliar or unpalatable, for, as we have seen, B D agree in altering it on two of the four occasions (ii 23, ix 30) when Mark uses it. παράγειν too is never used by Luke.

προσπορεύεσθαι (not in Matthew or Luke).

Mc. x 35 καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης.

This compound is found in the LXX, but nowhere else in N.T.

συνπορεύεσθαι (Luke three times: not in Matthew).

[Mc. x 1 καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν ℵ B and the mass of Greek MSS, followed by Tischendorf and W-H. Marcan usage shews conclusively that ὄχλος is right against ὄχλοι, and I have no doubt that συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος should be read with D 565 syr. sin. *a b c ff i k* (*conuenit turba*). The other reading has come in from Luke xiv 25 συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.]

The investigation leads to queer results as between the Gospels. The simple verb is common in Matthew, very common in Luke, but never occurs in Mark. Of the compounds Mark uses ἐκπορεύεσθαι rather often, and is not averse to παραπορεύεσθαι: but both are rarely or never found in the other two Synoptists. Luke on the other hand uses two compounds, διαπορεύεσθαι and συνπορεύεσθαι, which are never found in Matthew or Mark. Perhaps more curious still is the effort which scribes of Mark, and especially we may say the Alexandrian editor whose work is represented in B, have made to get rid of παραπορεύεσθαι and to introduce the forms preferred by Luke (in ii 23 διαπορεύεσθαι, in ix 30 πορεύεσθαι, cf. x 1 συνπορεύεσθαι): some similar instinct of Hellenic taste must, it would seem, have prompted both the evangelist and the Alexandrian scholar.

C. H. TURNER.

NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

X. *Usage of Mark*: (1) *Titles of address to Christ*; (2) *Diminutives*; (3) *The verb at the end of the sentence*; (4) ἵνα *not of purpose only*; (5) *absence of* λέγων (λέγοντες) *before a statement or question, where the main verb seems sufficient to imply it.*

As this series of notes draws to a close, each separate instalment becomes, almost inevitably, more miscellaneous in character. As some feature of St Mark's Gospel in relation to the other Synoptists strikes me, I proceed to group instances together, and to consider what general induction, if any, can be drawn from them. Many of the points have emerged in the course of the investigation into the 'agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark' on which I have been engaged in my Seminar for some years—an investigation now nearly complete. To the members of my Seminar (and I may be allowed to single out the Rev. R. H. Lightfoot of New College and the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College) I owe very much, and I must not omit also to mention the expert help of Mr J. U. Powell of St John's College, on whose knowledge of the literature concerned with the history and developement of the Greek language I draw whenever I am at a loss myself, and never draw in vain.

One characteristic of the present notes I should specially wish to emphasize, though I claim no finality for the conclusions which I have suggested, and that is the possibility that the Greek of St Mark has owed something, through his residence at Rome, to the influence of Latin. We all know that he transliterates Latin words more frequently than the other evangelists: but I suspect that Latin influence goes much farther than that, and I doubt whether writers on New Testament Greek have given adequate consideration to this side of their subject. I should like some one to treat systematically the Greek of Mark and of Hermas—both of them non-literary authors, both of them writing Greek in Rome—from this point of view.

My last instalment (IX: *J. T. S.* April 1928, xxix 275–289) was prepared under some pressure, during recovery from illness, and needs supplementing at two points.

i. Too late for insertion into my note on ἀποστερεῖν, pp. 275, 276, I consulted the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* under *abnego*, and the

reference there given to Wolfflin's article in his *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie* iv (1887) pp. 574–577. Wolfflin did not, I think, fully grasp the relation between *abnego* and ἀποστερεῖν in early Christian writers: but his collection of examples of *abnego*, as used of the refusal to return a sum deposited, is admirably full, and I complete my own list, *loc. cit.* p. 276, by the following:

Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* II xxxii 1 (xlviii 4) 'non solum non abnegare quae sunt aliena, sed etiam si sua auferantur illis [? aliis] non expostulare'.

Tertullian *ad Scapulam* 4 'Praeter haec depositum non abnegamus, matrimonium nullius adulteramus, pupillos pie tractamus, indigentibus refrigeramus, nulli malum pro malo reddimus'.

de fuga 12 *ad fin.* 'Quid autem Deo debeo, sicut denarium Caesari, nisi sanguinem quem pro me filius fudit ipsius? quodsi Deo quidem hominem et sanguinem meum debeo, nunc uero in eo sum tempore ut quod Deo debeo expostuler. utique fraudem Deo facio, id agens ne quod debeo soluam: bene obseruaui praeceptum, Caesari reddens quae sunt Caesaris, Deo uero quae sunt Dei abnegans'.

ii. In dealing with the compounds of πορεύεσθαι (p. 289) I omitted εἰσπορεύεσθαι (Mark 8, Matthew 1, Luke 5). Mark i 21 (no parallels): iv 19 (Matthew omits, Luke substitutes πορευόμενοι, but also changes the sense): v 40 (no parallels): vi 56 (Matthew omits; no parallel in Luke): vii 15, 18, 19, of the things that 'go into' a man (no parallel in Luke; Matt. 1° substitutes εἰσερχόμενον, 2° retains εἰσπορευόμενον, 3° omits): xi 2 (Matthew omits, Luke retains). Luke certainly does not dislike the form, for twice where Mark has εἰσέρχεσθαι (Mark x 23, xiv 14) he substitutes εἰσπορεύεσθαι. Matthew on the other hand, it seems, avoids very generally any compound of πορεύεσθαι (though he shews no reluctance to use πορεύεσθαι itself), preferring the compounds of ἔρχεσθαι, especially εἰσέρχεσθαι and προσέρχεσθαι.

(1) *Titles used in addressing Christ.*

i. Ῥαββεί (Ῥαββουνεί)

(*Mark four times*: *Matthew once* [*by Judas*]: *Luke never*).

1. ix 5 Ῥαββεί, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι. Matthew κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

2. x 51 Ῥαββουνεί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω. Matthew and Luke κύριε.

3. xi 21 Ῥαββεί, ἴδε ἡ συκῆ ἣν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται. Matthew changes the form of the sentence: no parallel in Luke.

4. xiv 45 Ῥαββεί· καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. Luke omits the address of Judas: Matthew, here only, retains the vocative Ῥαββεί.

ii. Διδάσκαλε

(*Mark ten times*: *Matthew six*: *Luke twelve*).

5. iv 38 Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; As in 1 above, Matthew has κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

6. ix 17 Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου. Again Matthew substitutes κύριε: Luke retains διδάσκαλε, as in 8, 11, 12, 13, in each case because it is not a disciple who is speaking.

7. ix 38 Διδάσκαλε, εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ... Luke ἐπιστάτα, for John is the speaker. No parallel in Matthew.

8. x 17 Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ... Both Luke (see on 6) and Matthew (as also in 11, 12) retain διδάσκαλε, for the reason given on 6 above.

9. x 20 Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ... Omitted by the other two, no doubt because the formal address had been used only three verses before.

10. x 35 Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμεν ... Omitted by Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

11. xii 14 (Pharisees and Herodians) ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Διδάσκαλε ... So both the others: they had no objection to the word as used by other Jews than the disciples.

12. xii 19 (Sadducees) ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Διδάσκαλε ... So both the other two, for just the same reason as in the last case.

13. xii 32 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεύς Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε ... Retained by Luke again on the same principle as before: no parallel in Matthew.

14. xiii 1 Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε ποταποὶ λίθοι ... The exclamation came from disciples, or a disciple, and so διδάσκαλε is avoided by Matthew: Luke, quite exceptionally, retains it in effect, for he inserts it two verses farther on.

iii. Κύριε

(*Mark once, by a non-Jew*: *Matthew twenty-two times, of which four occur in our Lord's teaching about Himself*: *Luke eighteen times*).

15. vii 28 Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ... And so, as we should expect, Matthew: there is no parallel in Luke. This unique occurrence of Κύριε in Mark is simply due to the fact that the woman was Ἑλληνίς, a heathen, and therefore used not the Jewish term 'Rabbi', but the ordinary title of respect 'Sir'.

Κύριε is inserted, where Mark has no title of address, at i 40 by both Matthew and Luke, at xiv 19 by Matthew, at xiv 29 by Luke.

iv. Ἰησοῦ

(*Mark three times, but always with a further defining phrase, and twice in the mouth of evil spirits: Luke six times: Matthew never*).

16. i 24 Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ, So Luke: no parallel in Matthew.

17. v 7 Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; So again Luke: Matthew omits the personal name.

18. x 47 Υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με. Again Luke follows Mark, though he inverts the personal and the official name: again Matthew retains the latter, but again omits Ἰησοῦ: according to many MSS he has Κύριε also. If an explanation is wanted of this isolated usage of the address 'Jesus' in Mark, it should perhaps be found in the setting of the episode as a whole. It is full of details that give it a place by itself in St Mark's Gospel: I believe it represents a story given *viva voce* by Bartimaeus to the evangelist, and therefore the phrase may well be that actually used by the man himself.

The deductions from the *data* here accumulated can be very briefly expressed. 'Rabbi', the Aramaic word, represented in Greek by διδάσκαλος, would have been in fact the form of address used to our Lord by any Jew, whether a disciple or not: and so Mark uses it, reserving κύριε for the solitary case where the speaker was not a Jew at all. But while Mark, or rather Peter, thus represents to us the language actually used in the days of our Lord's Ministry, the writers of the second generation could not picture our Lord's own disciples as addressing Him in the same way as those Jews did who were not His disciples: and therefore Matthew and Luke, while they retain the address Rabbi (Teacher) in the mouth of others than disciples—and Luke more consistently than Matthew—never allow it with disciples, save that Matthew keeps it in the case of Judas, no. 4, and Luke by exception in no. 14. Where Matthew and Luke differ, is just in this, that Matthew, when he substitutes another word, regularly employs κύριε (1, 2, 5, 6); Luke only once changes to κύριε (2), more often (1, 5, 7) to ἐπιστάτα. Ἐπιστάτα is only Lucan (six times in all): but even in Luke κύριε is much more common, and no doubt both Matthew and Luke mean by κύριε in this connexion not 'Sir' but 'Lord'.

(2) *Diminutives in Mark.*

i. θυγάτριον

(*twice in Mark: never in Matthew or Luke*).

1. v 23 τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει. Both Matthew and Luke substitute θυγάτηρ.

2. vii 25 ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον. Matthew again θυγατήρ: no Lucan parallel.

ii. ἰχθύδιον

(*Mark once, Matthew once*).

3. viii 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα. Retained in Matthew: there is no Luke.

iii. κοράσιον

(*Mark five times, Matthew thrice: never in Luke*).

4, 5. v 41, 42 Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον. Matthew omits the first, but retains the second, κοράσιον: but he also uses κοράσιον for the παιδίον of Mc. v 39. Luke changes the first κοράσιον to Ἡ παῖς, and omits the second.

6. vi 22 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ κορασίῳ. The episode is absent from Luke, the word from Matthew.

7, 8. vi 28 ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ· καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρί. Matthew retains the word on the first occasion, omits it on the second.

iv. κυνάριον

(*Mark and Matthew twice each: not in Luke*).

8, 9. vii 27, 28 λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης . . . Not in Luke: Matthew has both the episode and the double mention of κυνάρια. Phrynichus (quoted by Wetstein: Rutherford *New Phrynichus* p. 268) says that κυνίδιον, not κυνάριον, is the correct form of the diminutive.

v. σανδάλιον

(*once in Mark, but nowhere else in the Gospels*).

10. vi 9 ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια. Not in either Matthew or Luke: Luke omits the item, perhaps because it breaks into the catalogue of things that the Apostles were *not* to take with them; Matthew more skilfully adapts it to the negative framework of the catalogue by substituting μηδὲ ὑποδήματα—if they were to wear 'little sandals', they were not to wear boots or shoes. The diminutive σανδάλιον is apparently commoner in Greek than the form σάνδαλον.

vi. ψιχίον

(*once each in Mark and Matthew*).

11. vii 28 καὶ τὰ κυνάρια . . . ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων. And similarly the parallel in Matthew. Both ψίξ and ψιχίον appear to be rare words, but Suidas recognizes both forms: cod. D has ψιχων in both Gospels.

vii. ὠτάριον

(*once in Mark, followed by John: not in Matthew or Luke*).

12. xiv 47 ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον. So ℵ B D 1; and in the parallel passage John xviii 10 ℵ B C* L W. The rest have ὠτίον, following Matthew. Luke has οὖς in xxii 50 without variant, in the next verse D (with the Old Latins) again gives οὖς, the other MSS ὠτίον. Of all examples of diminutives in Mark, this is the most instructive, for, in contrast to words like θυγάτριον κοράσιον παιδίον, ears of adults are more or less similar in size—we cannot suppose that Mark means that Malchus' ear was a particularly small one—and the diminutive must be due simply to the writer's fondness for that type of word. Moreover ὠτάριον is not only a diminutive, but a diminutive of a diminutive. οὖς is the classical form, and as such is used by Luke: ὠτίον is the first stage of change, occurs occasionally in the LXX, and was probably in common use in the κοινή (οὖς ἀττικῶς, ὠτίον ἑλληνικῶς is quoted from a grammarian by Wetstein on Matt. xxvi 51): ὠτάριον is a further stage of change, but is cited mainly from comic verse—it was doubtless only colloquial. It is typically Marcan, and John has followed Mark. The preservation of ὠτάριον in the Alexandrian text (with D in Mark, and W in John) is a striking testimony to their faithfulness, for it must have been just the word they would have liked to alter. Note that Matthew goes only one stage back in substituting ὠτίον, while Luke goes the whole way with οὖς.

One word, diminutive in form, is not included in the above list, namely παιδίον. All three Synoptists use it regularly,[1] but again there is a significant distinction to be drawn: παῖς is used, though less frequently than παιδίον, in both Matthew and Luke, but it is nowhere found in Mark, and therefore παιδίον takes its place. Thus in the story of Jaeirus' daughter Mark has (besides θυγάτηρ, θυγάτριον, and κοράσιον) four instances of παιδίον, Matthew has θυγάτηρ and κοράσιον, Luke has θυγάτηρ and (twice) παῖς. The child was twelve years old, so that Luke made the dividing line between παῖς and παιδίον at an earlier point than twelve. Again in the miracle of ix 17–27 the boy healed had suffered ἐκ παιδιόθεν (*v.* 21), and therefore cannot have been a mere child: moreover he is brought to Christ, not carried (*vv.* 19, 20)—not to say that he is called by his father at the opening of the story (*v.* 17) 'my son': yet we have in Mark (*v.* 24) ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου. We are not surprised that both Matthew and Luke call the boy not παιδίον but παῖς. Clearly then there is no justification for translating the word

[1] Mark 12; Matthew 18, but chapter ii accounts for just half the instances; Luke 13, and again about half in chapters i and ii. Thus Mark is the one of the three who, apart from the Infancy narratives, uses the word most.

in Mark 'little child', as R. V. in ix 36, 37, x 13, 14, 15: in ix 36, 37 A. V. rightly has 'child' 'children', and in x 13 'young children' of A. V. is less incorrect than R. V.'s 'little children'.[1]

In the result Mark's fondness for diminutive forms is well established; at least with ὠτάριον and παιδίον, perhaps with other words, he uses such forms without any necessarily diminutive sense about them. Luke uses none of Mark's diminutives at all except παιδίον, and that, as we have just seen, as strictly diminutive in contrast with παῖς. Matthew, as so often, takes an intermediate place. Put in other words, Luke upholds a literary tradition stringently, Matthew makes some concession to popular usage, Mark reproduces whole-heartedly the colloquial talk of everyday life. The fondness for diminutives grows with the growth of the language. They are absent from Homer: they begin to abound in Aristophanes and the later comedians: in the first century after Christ it must have been a conscious literary archaism to avoid them.

(3) *The verb at the end of the sentence, after noun or personal pronoun.*

(a) *with the verb ἅπτεσθαι*

(*Mark eleven, Matthew ten, Luke ten*).

ἅπτεσθαι is thus a rather favourite word of Mark's, and his fondness for putting the verb after the pronoun (or noun) is specially noticeable in relation to it, so that I have treated it separately.

1. i 41 ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο. Both Matthew and Luke ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ. Perhaps the caution should be given that in Mark αὐτοῦ goes of course with ἥψατο and not with τὴν χεῖρα, which according to Greek idiom (and Latin usage is similar) would mean 'his hand' without the addition of any pronoun.

2. iii 10 ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας. No parallel in Matthew: but Luke again changes the order πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ.

[v 27 ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ. So by exception (though the addition of τοῦ ἱματίου makes the exception less marked), and so naturally the other two Synoptists here retain the same order of words.]

3. v 28 ἐὰν ἅψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ. So the critical editions, and so Matthew (Luke drops the verse): but Marcan usage makes it more than probable that the Alexandrian reading—it is only found in ℵ B C L Δ Θ—is an assimilation to the previous verse or to Matthew,

[1] Luke, however, here (xviii 15) has βρέφη, interpreting Mark's παιδία—rightly or wrongly—in this sense He also uses βρέφος four times in chapters i and ii, of the babe in the womb or newly born: his terms for age are more clearly articulated (as we should expect) than those of the other evangelists.

and that we ought to follow the rest of our authorities, including D and the Latins (it is true that Latins may be just following the idiom of their language), and invert the order κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ ἅψωμαι.

4. v 30 Τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων; Luke substitutes Τίς ὁ ἁψάμενός μου; Matthew drops the verse.

5. v 31 καὶ λέγεις Τίς μου ἥψατο; Matthew again gives no parallel: Luke, changing the interrogation to a statement, alters the order to Ἥψατό μού τις.

6. vi 56 ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται. No Luke: but Matthew makes the expected change ἵνα μόνον ἅψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.

7. vi 56 *b* καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο αὐτοῦ διεσώθησαν. But I suspect that with the Old Latins and Matthew (there is no Luke) we ought to omit αὐτοῦ. If Matthew had found αὐτοῦ in that position in his text of Mark, why in the world should he have omitted it?

[vii 33 πτύσας ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ. Compare v 27 above: no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.]

8. viii 22 παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται. Again no parallels.

9. x 13 προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται. So W-H with ℵ B C L Δ Θ 124 and Luke: Matthew ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς. But Tischendorf in Mark has ἅψηται αὐτῶν with the mass of authorities, including D W Old Latins and Origen. Decision is difficult: yet can we suppose that Luke found before him in Mark ἅψηται αὐτῶν, and altered it to αὐτῶν ἅψηται?

(b) *Other instances in Mark of the verb placed last, after its object, or the noun after the pronoun depending on it.*

10. i 44 σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ. So Matthew: but Luke δεῖξον σεαυτόν.

11. ii 5, 9 ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτιαι, with Matthew: Luke ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου.

12. iii 11 ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν. No parallels.

13. iv 30 ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν; No parallel in Matthew: Luke τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;

14. iv 41 ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούει. So in effect Matt.: Luke again inverts verb and personal pronoun, ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

15. v 4 οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι. No parallels.

16. v 10 ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ . . . No parallel in Matthew: Luke ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς . . .

17. vi 17 ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν. No parallel.

18. vi 20 ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν. Matthew in effect retains the construction while he alters the sense, ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. No Luke.

19. vii 18 οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι. No parallel.

20. ix 18 *a* ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ. Matthew omits: Luke, though with a change to the direct construction, ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν.

21. ix 18 *b* ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν. Omitted by Matthew: Luke again transposes, ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό.

22. ix 19 ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; So in effect Matthew: Luke ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς;

23. ix 32 ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι. Matthew has another phrase: Luke transposes ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτόν.

24. ix 37 ὃς ἂν ἓν τῶν παιδίων τούτων δέξηται. Here both the other Synoptists transpose, ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτο (Luke τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον).

25. x 2 εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι. No Luke: but Matthew ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

26. x 32 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λεγειν. Matthew and Luke both omit ἤρξατο, but both put the personal pronoun last, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς.

27. xi 28 τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν . . .; Both Matthew and Luke transfer τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην to the end, after the verb.

28. xii 12 *a* ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι. So Matthew: Luke ἐζήτησαν . . . ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας.

29. xii 12 *b* ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν. Matthew omits the noun, Luke transposes it εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.

30. xii 13 ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ. So Matthew: but Luke ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου.

31 (cf. **23**). xii 34 οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι. Matthew ἐπερωτῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐκέτι, Luke ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν.

32. xiv 1 πῶς αὐτὸν . . . ἀποκτείνωσιν. So in substance Matthew, but with τὸν Ἰησοῦν for αὐτόν: Luke τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν.

33. xiv 10 ἵνα αὐτὸν προδοῖ [παραδοῖ] αὐτοῖς. Both the others invert dative and accusative: Luke τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῷ αὐτόν, Matthew ἐγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν.

34. xiv 11 πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδοῖ. So Matthew ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῷ: but Luke εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτόν.

35. xiv 12 ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον. No parallel in Matthew: but Luke ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.

36. xiv 14 ὅπου τὸ πάσχα . . . φάγω. Luke by exception agrees: it is here Matthew who inverts, ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα.

37. xiv 30 τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Both the other Synoptists invert: Matthew τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με, Luke τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με.

38. xiv 42 ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με. Strictly speaking this instance does not come

under the heading of verb and object, as ἤγγικεν is intransitive; but the change of order in Matthew seems significant.

39. xiv 47 ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον. So Matthew: but Luke ἀφεῖλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν. Possibly Mark meant αὐτοῦ to depend upon ἀφεῖλεν, and if so his phrase would stand: but certainly Luke interpreted him in the other sense.

40. xiv 63 τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; with Matthew. Even here, where change seems less necessary, Luke alters to τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν;

41. xiv 65 οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔβαλον. No parallels.

42. xiv 72 ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν, and so Matthew: but Luke ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ.

43. xv 31 ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. So Matthew, and the emphasis on ἄλλους . . . ἑαυτόν seems to justify the order: but again Luke's instinct is for change, ἄλλους ἔσωσεν σωσάτω ἑαυτόν.

44. xvi 7 ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. Here, though Matthew follows Mark the order seems indefensible in Greek: but unfortunately there is no Lucan parallel.

It is not suggested that these instances are typical of Mark in the sense that this order of words is his normal usage: but they are not inconsiderable in number, and Luke's alteration of them in almost every case, whether instinctive or intentional, is certainly no mere accident—not even though the actual converse happens on occasion, as for instance (if our texts are correct) Mark xi 17 πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν, where the others give αὐτὸν ἐποιεῖτε (ἐποιήσατε) σπήλαιον λῃστῶν. In thirteen of our forty-four cases there is no Lucan parallel: of the remaining thirty-one, Luke makes the change to the normal Greek order of words in no less than twenty-nine, the exceptions being only 9, 36. Matthew, as so often, stands in between Mark and Luke, altering the Marcan order about as frequently as he leaves it unchanged; that is to say, out of twenty-eight cases where his text is parallel, he follows Mark in fourteen and diverges in thirteen (7 being a doubtful reading in Mark).

Whence did Mark derive his occasional use of an order of words so fundamentally alien to the Greek language? Greek puts the emphatic words in the forefront of the sentence, and the verb therefore cannot be left to the last. Latin, on the other hand, habitually closes the sentence with the verb. The conclusion seems irresistible that—just as Jerome in the Vulgate introduces a Graecizing order, putting words like *eius*, for instance, at the end of the sentence—Mark introduces in the Greek of his Gospel a Latinizing order. The influence which Mark's years of residence in Rome exercised over the developement of

his literary Greek style (if one may use such a phrase about his Gospel at all) was doubtless not inconsiderable. The Greek he had picked up in his boyhood at Jerusalem was, we may assume, wholly non-literary and colloquial. That it came in a Latin-speaking city to such maturity as it attained, is suggested forcibly by the feature of it which we have now been examining.

(4) ἵνα (*Mark* 1½ *columns*, *Matthew barely* 1, *Luke* 1; *John nearly* 3). *But in the following list* ἵνα *is only included when not used with its proper sense of purpose.*

1. iii 9 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ. No parallels.

2. v 18 παρεκάλει ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾖ. Luke ἐδέετο . . . εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ. No parallel in Matthew.

3. v 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ . . . ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ—so I think Mark means to construct the ἵνα (cf. 10). Matthew turns the sentence into *oratio recta*, ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες . . . Luke omits.

4. v 43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο. Nothing parallel in Matthew: Luke again has infinitive παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

5. vi 8 καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν. Both the others substitute the *oratio recta*, μὴ κτήσησθε, μηδὲν αἴρετε.

6. vi 12 καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν. Luke omits the phrase: Matthew has no parallel.

7. vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῷς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι . . . Matthew omits θέλω ἵνα and writes δός μοι ὧδε ἐπὶ πίνακι. Luke has no parallel for the six cases 7–12.

8. vi 56 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται. Here for the first time Matthew follows Mark.

9. vii 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ . . . Matthew again substitutes the *oratio recta*.

10. vii 32 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. Matthew omits the whole clause.

11. vii 36 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν. No parallel.

12. viii 22 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται. No parallel.

13. viii 30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ. Matthew for the second time agrees, διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν . . . Luke, as in 2 and 4, substitutes the infinitive, παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο.

14. ix 9 διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ ἃ εἶδον διηγήσωνται. Matthew changes to a command in the *oratio recta*, μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα, Luke to a statement of fact, οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν . . . οὐδὲν ὧν ἑώρακαν.

15. ix 12 πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ. No parallel.

16. ix 18 καὶ εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν. Matthew omits the ἵνα clause, Luke (with ἐδεήθη for εἶπα) here retains it.

17. ix 30 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ. Both the others omit the phrase.

18. x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν. Matthew omits the clause, Luke the whole episode, including 19.

19. x 37 δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . καθίσωμεν. And so Matthew, εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν . . .

20. x 48 καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ. So both Matthew and Luke, as in the next case.

21. x 51 ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ῥαββουνί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω. I believe that the construction with ἵνα depends (cf. no. 3) on the verb of the preceding verse θέλω ποιήσῃς. Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark closely here, and presumably constructed ἵνα in the same way after θέλειν.

22. xi 16 καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. No parallels.

23. xi 28 ἢ τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς; The ἵνα clause is strictly superfluous after ταύτην, and both Matthew and Luke seize on so good an excuse for omitting it.

24. xii 19 Μωυσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν . . . ἵνα λάβῃ . . . It would appear that ἵνα, which is not part of the O. T. quotation, must depend on ἔγραψεν. Matthew re-writes the quotation: Luke follows Mark, possibly supposing that ἵνα λάβῃ was from the LXX.

25. xiii 34 καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ. No parallels.

26. xiv 12 ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα; Luke omits the ἵνα clause, Matthew substitutes the infinitive φαγεῖν.

27. xiv 35 προσηύχετο ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα. Where Mark as here, and occasionally elsewhere, makes a statement in *oratio obliqua* and follows it by the same thing in *oratio recta*, Matthew and Luke do not repeat both of the two but prefer that in *oratio recta*; Matthew, however, has clearly taken εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρελθάτω from Mark's ἵνα παρέλθῃ, so that in his case at least the ἵνα clause is turned into a direct prayer.

28. xv 11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς. So in substance Matthew, with ἔπεισαν for ἀνέπεισαν: Luke has the *oratio recta*, ἀνέκραγον δὲ παμπληθεὶ λέγοντες Αἶρε τοῦτον ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν Βαραββᾶν.

29. xv 15 καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰ. φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ. So Matthew: Luke παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

30. xv 20 καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν. Both 30 and 29

could be rendered 'in order that', but in both cases the meaning is just 'to be crucified' 'to crucify', and Matthew rightly interprets with εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι. There is no parallel in Luke.

31. xv 21 καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν . . . Σίμωνα . . . ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. As in 29 Matthew follows Mark: Luke substitutes an infinitive, φέρειν.

Some of these instances of ἵνα, and perhaps especially the last three, are not so clearly non-purposive as the rest, and it is hardly surprising that Matthew here and there (8, 13, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 31) accepts the construction, as even Luke, though more rarely, does sometimes (16, 20, 21, 24). But the general instinct of both is to make a change, Matthew twelve times out of twenty, Luke thirteen times out of seventeen. Sometimes they merely omit: in other cases they substitute the *oratio recta* (so especially Matthew, five times: Luke twice) or an infinitive (so especially Luke, four times: Matthew once or twice).

But what then is the explanation of Mark's fondness for ἵνα after verbs like παρακαλεῖν διαστέλλεσθαι παραγγέλλειν ἐπιτιμᾶν ἐντέλλεσθαι and others? I cannot help thinking that we have here another illustration of the influence of the Latin of Rome on Mark's Greek: for in Latin we have *rogo ut*, *oro ut*, *impero ut*, *moneo* (*admoneo*) *ut*, *suadeo ut*, and so on.

No doubt ἵνα in the Κοινή generally was coming into much more general use than it had enjoyed in Attic Greek: any grammar of New Testament Greek will illustrate the point that ἵνα is no longer confined to the sense of purpose, and references need not be accumulated here. But writers on New Testament Greek are (naturally) inclined to exaggerate the extent to which it is a single self-contained whole: if these 'notes on Marcan usage' have done nothing else, they have, I hope, established the result that the Greek of one of the three Synoptic writers does shew broad, almost fundamental, differences from the Greek of the other two. And the more we emphasize the enlarged use of ἵνα throughout the range of the Κοινή, the more pressing, as it seems to me, is the need for accounting for the contrast in this respect between Mark and Luke. If Mark's extended use of ἵνα is not to be explained as a vulgarism, some other way of explaining it must be sought.

Now there are two or three directions in which recent investigations cited in Moulton's *Prolegomena* to the Grammar of N. T. Greek (1906) offer instructive parallels. Thumb (Moulton, p. 205) concludes that there were two rival tendencies, with a geographical dividing line between them, in this matter, Asiatic Greek leaning to a larger use of

the infinitive, Western and European Greek to the universalizing of ἵνα (it will be noted that Luke, as pointed out above, sometimes replaces the ἵνα of Mark by an infinitive), the European use having in modern Greek ousted the other alternative. To a similar result are we led by Kälker's emphasis (Moulton, p. 206) on the frequency of ἵνα in Polybius —for Polybius spent a large proportion of the years of his adult life in Italy. Add to this that Mark has been shewn, half a dozen pages back, to adopt, often enough to call for explanation, an order of words in his Greek which is not a Greek order but a Latin: and I submit that the thesis needs consideration that his exaggerated use of ἵνα should be traced back to the same source, his years of residence in Rome.[1]

These scholars who, like Moulton himself (p. 20)[1] and Rademacher (*Neutestamentliche Grammatik* p. 11), restrain within very narrow limits the influence of Latin on Hellenistic and New Testament Greek have perhaps not sufficiently investigated the possibility of this influence being specially great in individual writers such as St Mark: and it is only with regard to St Mark in contrast to the other two Synoptists that I plead for a reconsideration of the case.

(5) *Absence of* λέγων (λέγοντες) *after verbs introducing a statement or a question, where Matthew and Luke add or substitute it.*

i. ἀγανακτεῖν

1. xiv 4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη . . . ; Matthew ἠγανάκτησαν λέγοντες Εἰς τί . . . No Luke.

ii. ἀποκρίνεσθαι

2. viii 4 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταί τις . . . Matthew λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί Πόθεν ἡμῖν . . . No Luke.

3. ix 17 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου. Matthew προσῆλθεν . . . λέγων, Luke ἐβόησεν λέγων.

4. xii 29 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστίν . . . Matthew ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ . . . Luke ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν . . .

iii. βοᾶν

5. xv 34 ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἠλεὶ Ἠλεὶ . . . Matthew ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰ. φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων . . . No parallel in Luke: but cf. no. 3.

[1] Moulton (p. 21 and p. 21 n. 3) admits that some writers are more disposed than he is himself to allow some place to Latin influence, e.g. Blass *Grammatik des NTlichen Griechisch* p. 4; and on more general lines W. Schulze *Graeca Latina*.

iv. διαλογίζεσθαι

6. ii 6 διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν Τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ; Luke ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι λέγοντες Τίς . . . Matthew εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Οὗτος . . .

7. viii 16 διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν. Matthew διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες ὅτι Ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν. No Luke.

v. διαστέλλεσθαι

8. ix 9 διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδένι ἃ εἶδον διηγήσωνται. Matthew ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰ. λέγων· Μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα. No Luke.

vi. ἐπερωτάω (ἐρωτάω)

9. v 9 ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν Τί ὄνομά σοι; Luke ἐπερώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰ. λέγων Τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; Nothing parallel in Matthew.

10. vii 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. Matthew προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγουσα Κύριε, βοήθει μοι. No Luke.

11. viii 5 ἠρώτα αὐτούς Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; Matthew substitutes λέγει for ἠρώτα. There is no Luke.

12. viii 29 ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Matthew and Luke substitute λέγει (εἶπεν) for ἐπηρώτα.

13. ix 28 κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; Once more Matthew κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπον· Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς . . . No parallel to this verse in Luke.

14. x 2 ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν Εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι; πειράζοντες αὐτόν. Matthew προσῆλθον αὐτῷ . . . πειράζοντες αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντες Εἰ ἔξεστιν . . . Again no Luke.

15. x 17 προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν Διδάσκαλε . . . Luke adds λέγων (ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων λέγων Διδάσκαλε . . .), Matthew as elsewhere substitutes εἶπεν (εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν Διδάσκαλε . . .).

16. xii 28 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη . . . Matthew for once repeats Mark's phrase; Luke, in a more or less parallel passage, substitutes ἀνέστη . . . λέγων.

17. xiii 3 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος . . . Εἰπὸν ἡμῖν πότε . . . Both Matthew and Luke add λέγοντες: Luke keeps ἐπηρώτησαν, for which Matthew has his favourite phrase προσῆλθον αὐτῷ.

18. xv 2 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πειλᾶτος Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰ.; Both the others retain the verb (Luke ἠρώτησεν), but both add λέγων.

[vii. ἐπιτιμάω

19. i 25 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε. So Tischendorf with ℵ*A*, but the rest agree with Luke ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰ. λέγων . . ., and that may probably be right: though the caution must

be given that the Old Latins frequently add *dicens* where Mark's text is without it (so *k* in ix 29, x 17, xii 28, xv 2: not in x 2, xiii 3), presumably following the idiom of their language.]

viii. κατακρίνειν

20. xiv 64 οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου. Matthew turns it with λέγειν into the *oratio recta* οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστίν. No parallel in Luke.

[ix. κηρύσσειν

21. i 14, 15 κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός ... So again Tischendorf with ℵ* *c* Origen, against the rest, who add λέγων or καὶ λέγων before ὅτι; Matthew ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν. Once more, as with ἐπιτιμᾶν, the want of clear Marcan parallels weights the balance against the reading of ℵ.]

x. κράζω (with λέγειν, however, 5/8)

22. xi 9 ἔκραζον Ὡσαννά. Matthew and Luke both add λέγοντες, and Luke substitutes αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν for κράζειν.

23, 24. xv 13, 14 ἔκραξαν· Σταύρωσον αὐτόν ... περισσῶς ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. Here Matthew has λέγουσιν πάντες ... περισσῶς ἔκραξον λέγοντες; Luke has ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες on the first occasion, and phrases the second differently.

xi. λαλεῖν

25. xiv 31 ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει Ἐάν δέῃ με συναποθανεῖν σοι ... Matthew λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος Κἂν δέῃ με ..., and so Luke, though he has only a rougher parallel, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

Perhaps no very striking results emerge. Nearly half the instances cited are in connexion with a single verb ἐπερωτάω (ἐρωτάω), and here we may safely say that Mark uses it without λέγω, the other two tend either to add λέγω (so Luke 4/6) or to substitute it (so Matt. 7/9). As to the remaining ten verbs, it is not meant to be suggested that Mark's normal usage is to employ them without λέγω: but even if the instances are exceptional, they are at the same time numerous enough to justify the impression that he can on occasion use any verb which implies 'saying' without adding the actual phrase 'saying', while with Matthew and Luke the rule is almost absolute the other way. And just as with Mark's ἐπερωτάω, so with the other verbs, Matthew prefers the substitution of λέγω, Luke the addition. Mark's omission of λέγω is no Latinism, but is probably just colloquial rather than literary language. But it accounts for some half-dozen of these agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark which have disturbed the judgement of so many critics.

C. H. TURNER.

NOTES AND STUDIES

A TEXTUAL COMMENTARY ON MARK I.

FOR something like forty years I have been interested in the problem of the textual criticism of the New Testament: and for the last seven years I have been devoting special attention to the Gospel according to St Mark, its exegesis, its relation to the other two Synoptic Gospels, and its text. As to the exegesis I am contributing the section on St Mark to a brief commentary on the whole Bible which may, I hope, appear before the end of 1927. But that commentary is confined to the English version, and, as regards any questions of the text, can only deal with them indirectly and incompletely. I am therefore venturing to put before the readers of this JOURNAL a specimen, covering only the first chapter, of what I should like to do for the text of the Gospel as a whole. The specimen is purely tentative; my object has been to comment on all readings that are important in themselves and on any readings where the text that I have constructed differs from the critical texts in use. I have cited regularly the readings of Westcott and Hort, as the edition of the Greek Testament which (in my view) at present holds the field, and frequently, but not exhaustively, the readings of Tischendorf, which are also the readings of Huck's *Synopsis*. But in order to concentrate attention on the things that seem to me really salient, and to find room for discussion and explanation of variant readings, I have had to limit myself in the list of authorities cited to those only that are the oldest and the most important. In any such selection some personal and subjective element must come into play, and the choice may here and there seem arbitrary. Naturally my ruling idea has been to give prominence to those authorities or groups of authorities in which, according to my judgement, a strain of early tradition may be looked for, especially where it may be argued that insufficient attention has been given to that evidence in the critical editions of the past.

Put in other words, this means that, in company with a good many scholars of our day, I should hold that the chief defect in Westcott and Hort's great work lay in their comparative neglect of what is called the Western text.[1] In so far as their purpose was to put the coping-stone to the achievement of the long and slow process of the replacing of the Received Text by a text based wholly on 'pre-Syrian' testimony,

[1] I say 'comparative neglect', because it is well known that, however timidly, they did give the preference to a number of omissions, especially towards the end of St Luke, guaranteed only by D and Old Latin MSS.

I should have no quarrel with them; nor should I entirely differ from them in their estimate of the individual excellence of the codex Vaticanus, B. But I cannot resist the conclusion that convergent proof from different quarters and of different sorts does compel us to lay very much more weight than they did on the evidence of 'Western' authorities. And here one is naturally faced at once with the question what exactly one means by 'Western'. For as first used in the eighteenth century the word meant just what it said: it was a symbol to represent the evidence of those MSS and writers, whether Greek or Latin, that belonged to the Western half of the Roman Empire. But in the course of the nineteenth century witnesses to a Western type of text—to a text at any rate that had as marked agreements with strictly Western authorities as with Alexandrian or Neutral authorities—began to be detected in an ever-increasing number in the East. In Syria, if the *Diatessaron* of Tatian derives its Western character from the fact that its Greek original was composed in Rome, the Old Syriac 'Separate' Gospels must have been rendered from a local Greek text. In north-eastern Asia Minor the late uncial codex Θ testifies to the survival in remote corners of a pre-Byzantine, more or less 'Western' text, some centuries after the Lucianic or Byzantine text had come into official use at Antioch and Constantinople. And Dr Streeter, following out indications given by Prof. Lake, would combine the evidence of Θ with the evidence of various important cursives such as the Ferrar group (13–69–124–346 etc.) and the MSS 565 and 700, and would refer this whole branch of the tradition to an original home in Caesarea and Palestine. Finally, Egypt itself, the one district which provides the whole evidence for Hort's Neutral text, does not speak in this respect with a consentient voice. There are divergent witnesses: 'Western' elements can perhaps be detected in the earliest vernacular version of Egypt, the Sahidic, and more markedly in the newly discovered Freer MS of the Gospels (W) and also, as Prof. Burkitt shewed, in Clement of Alexandria.

Now if all these types of so-called Western text are united against the Alexandrian or Neutral text, it is obvious that, whether we regard its age or its wide diffusion, it makes a very strong claim for consideration, and a claim that is stronger now, owing to fresh discoveries, than it was in the days of Dr Hort. But to speak in this sense of a Western text seems to me now so entirely misleading that I prefer to revert to Griesbach's usage, and mean by Western the authorities that are Western geographically. If the word is used in the other and wider sense, it is better to be careful to put it into inverted commas as 'Western': it is better still, I think, to drop 'Western' in this sense as far as possible, and to group these types of text, whether Western or Eastern, under the common heading 'unrevised'. Such a heading

admittedly implies a contrast with a type of text that is revised, and I feel no doubt that the text contained in the codex Vaticanus is the fruit of a revision—a revision very carefully and very skilfully done, so that B stands out as our best witness to the text of the Gospels, but a revision for all that.

But since B may be said, since the publication of Westcott and Hort's edition in 1881, to hold the field, some brief summary must be given *in limine* of the sort of reasons which seem to me to qualify its sureness as a guide, and to reduce it to a lower pedestal than that on which Hort placed it. If B is, as I think it is, a product of the highest kind of Alexandrine scholarship, we have to begin by asking ourselves on what lines Alexandrine criticism was accustomed to treat classical authors. And among classical authors Homer is for our purpose supreme, because Homer presents the nearest parallel, in the temper of veneration with which his writings were approached, to the Bible of Christians. This temper almost inevitably led to 'recension', to the omission for instance of anything that seemed ἀπρεπές or ἀπίθανον. Do we not see just the same temper at work in Mc. i 41 when ὀργισθείς is replaced by σπλαγχνισθείς, in Mc. xv 34, where ὠνείδισας has made way for ἐγκατέλιπες, or again, to cite a case where Bℵ stand alone save for a small handful of cursives, in vii 4, the emendation of βαπτίσωνται—as being consecrated in Christian usage to the sacrament of Baptism—into ῥαντίσωνται. Once more, Alexandrian scribes or editors, with a great inheritance of Greek culture to live up to, were under a strong temptation to correct even an evangelist (to them it would seem the corrupted text of an evangelist) into accord with Greek grammar and literary usage: in viii 2 ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι is emended into ἡμέραις τρισίν, in viii 3 ἥκασιν is turned into εἰσίν, in ix 8 οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλά becomes (with Matthew) οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μή, while the preposition εἰς, which Mark frequently uses for ἐν, is regularized by the insertion of εἰσελθεῖν or the like, as in Mc. i 21, viii 26. Less common, but still worthy of notice, are the indications that alternative readings with an introductory ἤ had been jotted down by some scholar in the margin of some early Alexandrian ancestor of B (and other MSS), and in the next copy incorporated in the text, e.g. Lc. x 41 ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἑνός, Lc. xii 47 καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας. And finally the tradition represented by B is unfortunately not quite exempt from the temptation to supplement one Gospel from another, or to assimilate it to another even by a process of omission. Mark is perhaps the Gospel which has suffered most in this way: compare the additions in i 34 χριστὸν εἶναι (from Lc. iv 41), or in iii 14 οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν (from Lc. vi 13), and the omission in x 19 of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς (in accord with Mt. xix 18, Lc xviii 20).

As to the date and place of origin of B, Dr Ropes in his new edition of the Acts (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part III) has drawn out very persuasively, following Rahlfs, the arguments which bring it into relation with St Athanasius: and as it is quite certain that so sumptuous a MS can only have been written for a great person or a great church, I am disposed to regard with favour the conjecture which identifies it with a copy prepared under Athanasius about A. D. 340 for the emperor Constans.

Similar considerations convince me that codex ℵ, a no less sumptuous MS, must also have been written with some similar purpose: and I want to ventilate the hypothesis—I do not propound it as more than a hypothesis—that its origin should be brought into connexion with the known activity (twice mentioned by Jerome) of the bishops Acacius and Euzoius of Caesarea, about the middle of the fourth century, in causing the worn out papyri of the famous library of their church to be copied on the more durable material of vellum. If it is objected that the text of ℵ is of an Alexandrian type rather than of the type which Dr Streeter has adduced reasons for calling Caesarean, I should meet the point by asking further whether ℵ may not have been, in part or in whole, transcribed from the papyrus rolls which Origen, rather more than a century earlier, may be presumed to have brought with him when he left Egypt to settle in Palestine. I cannot pretend to have made more examination of the available material than covers the first twenty-four verses of Mc. i: but in these verses there are seven significant readings where Origen *in Jo.* sides with ℵ against B, and the first of them is the highly important omission of υἱοῦ θεοῦ in Mc. i 1, where ℵ Origen stand nearly alone. There is here at least, I am sure, a case for inquiry. And I cannot think it open to question that Jerome had had access to ℵ before he published his edition of the Vulgate Gospels.

But something must also be said, however briefly, in support of the stress which it seems to me should be laid on the evidence of D and of the best of the Old Latin MSS. When D stands alone, it cannot indeed be safely trusted as a guide: but the case is different when it has the support of any one of the three leading Old Latins, cod. Bobiensis (*k*), cod. Palatinus (*e*), or cod. Vercellensis (*a*). I will not attempt on this occasion to do more than enumerate three objective tests which, as I think, combine to recommend these authorities to our close attention.

(i) The use of *Nomina Sacra*. Of Greek MSS D comes next to B in its sparing use of any but the four universal abbreviations of θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός. Of Latin MSS *k* stands alone in never abbreviating the word which was first added to these four, namely πνεῦμα = spiritus: one hand of B is the only parallel to this

feature in *k* among Greek MSS. There is a presumption that MSS which distinguish themselves in respect of limiting the *Nomina Sacra* that are subject to abbreviation, represent the earliest types of text.

(ii) The supposed agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in those parts of their Gospels which are taken from Mark: by 'agreements' in this sense is meant of course agreements in changes which do not look as though Mt. and Lc. would have hit on them independently. In comparison with Tischendorf's edition, Westcott and Hort by help of B had already removed a certain number of these, e.g. Mc. ii 9 ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε Tischendorf, where Mt. and Lc. for ὕπαγε have περιπάτει, and W-H read περιπάτει also in Mc. with ABC*bce*: περιπατεῖν is a specially Marcan word. But on Western evidence (and as often without D as with it) we can take a long step further in abolishing other supposed agreements: four instances will illustrate this, Mc. vi 43, ix 19, xii 8, xiv 72. (1) In vi 43 Mt. Lc. and Jo. all appear to agree against Mc. in giving some form of the verb περισσεύω, while the editors give in Mc. ἦραν κλάσματα [or κλασμάτων] δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα. But *a ff i* [neither *e* nor *k* is here extant] have 'reliquias fragmentorum', with 33 τὰ περισσεύματα. Read ἦραν [περισσεύματα] κλασμάτων and all is clear: a line was lost in a very early copy, not so early however but that the archetype of the oldest Latin version had escaped the loss. (2) In ix 19 Mc. has ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος, the parallels in Mt. and Lc. are printed as ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, and it would be in the highest degree unlikely that Mt. and Lc. had independently added the second adjective from Deut. xxxii 5. But then we find that in Lc. it is omitted by Marcion (on the testimony of both Tertullian and Epiphanius), by *a* and by *e*. Once more Western witnesses solve the difficulty for us. (3) In Mc. xii 8 ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλον, the heir is murdered in the vineyard and the body thrown outside: in our texts of Mt. and Lc. the two verbs are inverted, and the heir is first ejected and then killed. But in Mt. xxi 39 we ought to replace ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλον on the testimony of D Θ *a b c e ff h* Iren. Lucif. (4) For Mc. xiv 72 ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν the other Synoptists are edited as giving ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς. But the phrase in Lc. (xxii 62) is omitted by *a b e ff i l** and is bracketed by W-H. Omit it as an interpolation from Mt., and once more all is plain sailing.

(iii) The third test is that of Marcan usage: I will confine myself to the citation of three instances of absence of particles (καί, ναί, οὖν), and one of plural for singular in describing the movements of our Lord and the disciples. i 22 ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς D Θ *b c e*: the rest καὶ οὐχ with Mt. vii 28 Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια κτλ D W Θ *fam.* 13 565 *b c ff i* syr-sin.: the rest ναί, Κύριε with Mt. x 9 ὃ ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν D *k*: ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς the rest with Mt. xi 11 καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν Θ *i k*: the rest εἰσῆλθεν with Mt. and Lc.

These preliminary remarks are adequate, I hope, to bespeak a patient hearing for the deference paid from time to time in the following pages to Western evidence, even where a reading is only guaranteed by one or two authorities. I do not claim more than to have made out a case for consideration. Least of all must I be supposed to be supporting indiscriminately the majority of Western readings against the majority of the readings of B: I have only tried to consider each case on its merits.

TEXT OF MARK I.

1 ΑΡΧΗ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ 2 (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν
τῷ Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ
Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν
ὁδόν σου·
3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους ⸢αὐτοῦ⸣)
4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς
ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. 5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ

3. ⸢τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν⸣

1–4. Ἀρχὴ . . . ἁμαρτιῶν : to be constructed, with Origen, Basil, and Victor of Antioch, as a single sentence, verses 2 and 3 being parenthetical. See *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1925 (xxvi 146). Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ : omitted by ℵ* Θ, two cursives and some patristic quotations. But these quotations are in all cases directed to the comparison of the different openings of the four Gospels, in particular to their appropriateness to the respective evangelic symbols : and with this view they tend to omit as much intervening matter as possible. Thus Irenaeus, to whom Mark is the eagle of the four, finds the point of appropriateness in the prophetic afflatus from on high, and hurries on to the prophetic reference : Victorinus, making Mark the lion, omits not only 'Son of God' but also the quotation from Malachi, in order to put the 'vox clamantis in deserto' as near the forefront as possible : the words υἱοῦ θεοῦ, not conferring anything to the purpose of either father, are simply dropped. To conclude that the words did not stand in their copies of the Gospel would not be warranted : Irenaeus in fact twice gives the words in other citations. Origen indeed stands in another category, for as he omits the words five times it must be presumed that they were absent from his text : but in view of his close relation to ℵ we have in ℵ Origen really not two witnesses to deal with but only one. And it is (against Tischendorf and W-H text) infinitely more probable that in two early authorities $\overline{\text{ΥΥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΘΥ}}$ had dropped out after $\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΧΥ}}$ than that the majority of good texts (including B D) are wrong in retaining words which correspond so entirely to the contents of the Gospel (cf. i 11, iii 11, viii 38, ix 7, xii 6, xiv 61, xv 39). 2. ἀποστέλλω (without ἐγώ) B D Θ 28 latt. Iren. W-H : *praem.* ἐγώ ℵ W most Greek MSS Orig. ἐγώ is an assimilation to Mt. iii 10 and Mal. iii 1 (ℵ^c A Q Γ). 3. αὐτοῦ : τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν D Old Latins and apparently Iren. This may be, and perhaps is, an assimilation to Isa. xl 3, but the alternative that αὐτοῦ is an assimilation to the parallels in Mt. Lc. cannot be quite excluded. 4. Ἰωάνης : here and in verses 6, 9, B only ; see below on verse 29 (B D). ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων B 33 W-H : *praem.* καὶ *ante* κηρύσσων Tisch. with the other MSS. A good example of the excellence of B : scribes did not realize that in Mark's usage (vi 14, 24) ὁ βαπτίζων meant 'the Baptist', for they were only familiar with ὁ βαπτιστής. So they regarded βαπτίζων and κηρύσσων as two participles in the same construction 'John who was baptizing and preaching', and connected them with καί. They forgot that, strictly speaking, it was the preaching that was done 'in the wilderness' ; the baptizing was 'in the river Jordan', verse 5.

Ἱεροσολυμεῖται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. [6] καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάνης ἐνδεδυμένος ⸀δέρριν⸀ καμήλου ⸆ καὶ ἔσθων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

[7] Καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω [μου], οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· [8] ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

[9] Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν ⸆ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάνου· [10] καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· [11] καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν

6. ⸀τρίχας⸀ ⸆ καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ 9. ⸆ ὁ

6. δέρριν D (δερρην) *a* (pellem): τρίχας (Tisch. W-H) the rest (*def. e* to i 20). It is so difficult to account for δέρρις—a rare word, meaning 'skin' of an animal—that the agreement of D (not *d*) with *a* claims for it more than a place in the margin. Assimilation to Mt. ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου would account for supersession of a rare, probably vulgar, word by the more familiar word of the more familiar Gospel. Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. δέρρις assert that in the 'Western text' here δέρρις 'has been transferred from Zech. xiii 4' ἐνδύσονται δέρριν τριχίνην ἀνθ' ὧν ἐψεύσαντο—which is surely very improbable—and quote Hesychius δέρρεις· τὸ παχὺ ὕφασμα, ᾧ εἰς παραπέτασμα [= a hanging] ἐχρῶντο. It is a not unlikely word for Mark, and I suspect that it is genuine. καμήλου D *a b d ff t*: *add.* καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ the rest, with Tisch. W-H. I have treated the shorter reading as a 'Western non-interpolation', because it is not unlikely in itself that Mt. (iii 4) should have supplemented Mark's description by drawing from the description of Elijah, the Baptist's prototype, in 4 Reg. i 8 the words καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην [περιεζωσμένος] τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, and that scribes should have assimilated Mark's text to Mt. Mark depends less on O.T. language than the other Synoptists. In Mt. ζώνην has a proper construction (εἶχεν), and so too in Apoc. i 13 (περιεζωσμένον). 7. μου: *om.* B Orig., a much stronger combination than ℵ Orig., and I have (though with much doubt) followed W-H against Tisch. in bracketing the word. 8. ὕδατι . . . πνεύματι ἁγίῳ B vg W-H. A variation where the other Synoptic texts are bound to have had influence on the scribes of Mark: Mt. gives ἐν ὕδατι . . . ἐν πνεύματι without variant (and cf. Jo. i 26, 31, 33), Luke ὕδατι . . . ἐν πνεύματι practically without variant (so Acts i 5, xi 16, and this must be definitely taken as the Lucan usage), and in view of the wide divergence of the witnesses in Mark, a reading like ὕδατι . . . πνεύματι, unsupported elsewhere in N.T., has strong claims.

9. Ἰησοῦς Tisch. W-H: I have given ὁ Ἰησοῦς (D Δ Θ etc.) a place in the margin, because, just as we have in verse 6 ὁ Ἰωάνης, so it seems natural to expect the article here. And ὁ Ἰησοῦς seems to be Mark's usage: cf. i 14, i 17, i 25, ii 17, ii 19, etc. 11. φωνή, without verb (W-H margin Tisch.) ℵ* D *ff t*; φωνὴ . . . ἠκούσθη Θ 28 is evidence on the same side, as also Mt.'s φωνὴ . . . λέγουσα: *add.* ἐγένετο ℵ^c A B L W sah etc. W-H text, but the verb has probably come from Luke iii 22 φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι. In the corresponding episode at the Transfiguration the textual phenomena are much the same: Mt. as here φωνὴ . . . λέγουσα, Luke apparently φωνὴ ἐγένετο . . . λέγουσα, Mark (ix 7) ἐγένετο φωνή ℵ B C L Δ, ἦλθεν φωνή A D Θ and most Old Latins with syr-sin, φωνή alone W *fam.* 1 and *b*: the rival verbs in Mark, with

Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

12 καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, 13 καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ· καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων,
καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

14 ⸀ΜΕΤΑ ΔΕ⸃ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάνην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν
Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ θεοῦ, 15 ⸆λέγων ὅτι
Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ·
μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

14. ⸀καὶ μετὰ⸃ 15. ⸆καὶ

the omission of verb in Mt., seem to me to point to omission (evidenced by three good authorities) as right in Mark. ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός: I have printed these words without comma after μου (against Swete), and in quotation type (against W-H), because I believe that they are an echo of Gen. xxii 2 λάβε τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, 12, 16, οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ, and that the meaning of ἀγαπητός in connexion with υἱός is the same here as there, namely not 'beloved' but 'only'. St Paul also gave a Christian application to the passage in Genesis, and also interpreted ἀγαπητός as 'his own son', Rom. viii 32 τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο (where the verb seems decisive of the reference to Gen. xxii 12, 16). See the discussion of the phrase in *J. T. S.* xxvii (Jan. 1926), especially the passages of Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* iv 24, 29, loc. cit. p 126, where the equivalence of τὸ μονογενές and τὸ ἀγαπητόν is emphasized: the idiom was unfamiliar in Athanasius's day, but he appeals to pagan scholars Ἕλληνες ἴσασιν οἱ δεινοὶ περὶ τὰς λέξεις.

14. Μετὰ δέ ℵ A L Δ Θ W, most O.L. MSS and vg, Tisch.: Καὶ μετά B D (not *d*) *a* syr-sin W-H—so good a combination that one relegates it to the margin with diffidence. As we know, St Mark's normal way of commencing a new paragraph is with καί, while the other Synoptists, Luke especially, prefer δέ: what are we to say when the authorities in Mark are divided? Let us look at the other instances where a paragraph begins with δέ. They are (if we except xv 16, where I am sure a smaller division than a paragraph should be made) only three in number in W-H, vii 24, x 32, xiv 1, and they are each significant of a great break in the story. At vii 24 our Lord passes for the first time outside the confines of Palestine: at x 32 Jerusalem is for the first time mentioned as the objective of our Lord's movements: at xiv 1 the Ministry is over, and the Passion story commences. Is there any similar emphasis at i 14? W-H imply that there is not, for they print the first words of verse 9 in capitals, and make no break beyond an ordinary paragraph at verse 14. If καί is right, their arrangement may be right, though in that case καί must be wrong (and B right to omit it) in verse 9. But I cannot think that this absence of break at verse 14 corresponds with the intention of the Evangelist: I think the commencement of the Ministry must have been marked by him as a crucial moment, while on the other hand the previous verses belong to the Preparation. John the Baptist was but a precursor: he pointed to one who was to follow, and his baptism of the Christ was the culmination of his work, after which he passes out of the story. So though there is a break between verses 8 and 9, there is also still a connexion between John and Jesus: and the greater break comes when the Preparation is complete, and the Ministry of John is succeeded by the Ministry of Christ. Moreover this is the commencement of Peter's continuous story as an eye-witness. On internal grounds then I prefer δέ in verse 14. τῆς

16 Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ
Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (ἦσαν γὰρ
ἁλεεῖς), 17 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου· καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς
γενέσθαι ἁλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων. 18 καὶ ⸀εὐθὺς⸀ ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν
αὐτῷ. 19 καὶ προβὰς ὀλίγον εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ
Ἰωάνην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα·
20 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ
πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. 21 καὶ εἰσπορεύονται
εἰς Καφαρναούμ.
Καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν· 22 καὶ ἐξεπλήσ-

18. ⸀εὐθέως⸀

βασιλείας A D W Γ *a r* vg : *om.* ℵ B L Θ 1 28 33 *b ff t* syr-sin sah Orig. Tisch. W-H. External evidence is no doubt stronger for omission. internal evidence tells the other way, for *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* is a favourite phrase of Mark's, and as a rule absolutely 'the good news'. In i 1 *τοῦ εὐ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* means 'the good news of', i.e. about, 'Jesus Christ': he is in fact the good news. You could therefore say 'the good news of the kingdom', i.e. the establishment by Jesus Christ of the Kingdom of God upon earth: but it is difficult to see that 'the good news about God' is a natural phrase. On the whole I think it probable that a line ΤΗϹ ΒΑϹΙΛΕΙΑϹ—11 or 12 letters are the size of a line in a papyrus roll of the primitive Gospel type—dropped out of a very early copy. We should then have in the Evangelist's summary the two phrases which he immediately repeats in our Lord's own words, the 'kingdom of God' and the 'good news', i.e. of the coming of the Kingdom. 15. *λέγων* ℵ[a] A D *a b ff r t* sah : *καὶ λέγων* B L W Θ W-H text : *om.* ℵ* *c* syr-sin Orig. Tisch. W-H marg. Omission can appeal to evidence in i 25 ℵ* A*, i 27 *e*, ii 12 B W *b*: but the more or less pleonastic *ὅτι* is thoroughly characteristic of Mark's style, and is always preceded by a verb like *λέγων* (see *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1926, xxviii 9–15). The real question is the genuineness of *καί*. There is a parallel in i 40 *παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν, [καὶ] λέγων*: and in both cases it is perhaps easier to understand the insertion of *καί* than its omission.

18. *εὐθύς*. On this occasion the evidence for *εὐθύς* (against *εὐθέως*) drops to its lowest: ℵ L 33 (add here Θ) are the only constant quantities. The critical texts assume, probably with justice, that *εὐθύς* is Marcan usage, and should be read even in doubtful cases. *εὐθέως* is the regular Κοινή word, and is largely preponderant over *εὐθύς* in the texts of Matthew and Luke as given by modern editors: in Mark it is given throughout by A D, and B C Δ only rally to *εὐθύς* after some hesitation on the earlier occasions of its use. Why Mark should have preferred *εὐθύς* we cannot tell. Perhaps we should refer both the frequency and the form of the word to a mannerism of St Peter in his oral Gospel teaching.

21. *ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν*. So ℵ C L Δ syr-sin Orig. Tisch. W-H mg. If it were not for Mc.'s habitual use of *εἰς* for *ἐν*, the authority for this reading would be inadequate, and we should prefer to follow A B D W Θ O.L. and add *εἰσελθών* with W-H text. But this is a good case of the coincidence of the more difficult reading with well-established Marcan usage (see *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1924, xxvi 15), and I have little doubt that *εἰσελθών* was put in to ease the construction, as in viii 26 (*εἰσέλθῃς* for *εἴπῃς*), i 39 (*ἦλθεν* for *ἦν*). 22. *οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς* D Θ *b c d e* (*def. a*): the rest with the editors prefix *καί*, but the asyndeton before *οὐχ* is in Mc.'s jerky style

σοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, οὐχ
ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.
23 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ,
24 καὶ ἀνέκραξεν λέγων Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι
ἡμᾶς· ⌜οἶδά⌝ σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. 25 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
λέγων Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ⌜ἐξ αὐτοῦ⌝. 26 καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ
ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. 27 καὶ ἐθαμ-
βήθησαν ἅπαντες, ὥστε συνζητεῖν αὐτοὺς λέγοντας Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ
καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακού-

24. ⌜οἴδαμεν⌝ 25. ⌜ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου⌝

(cf. x 14), and the addition of *καί* with Mt. is easier to explain than its omission. See *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1926, xxviii 15–19.

24. *λέγων* ℵ* B D W Θ 565 Old Latins and Vulg., syr-sin (*def.* sah): + *ἔα* (from Luke) practically all others. I note this variant reading simply to illustrate (i) the enormous influence a parallel passage in the other Synoptists can exert, (ii) the value of our new witnesses W Θ, (iii) the agreement of a very few of the best or oldest Greek MSS with the best and oldest versions. *ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς.* A statement or a question? Mc.'s command of Greek particles is so inadequate that here and elsewhere (e. g. xvi 6) he leaves us in doubt. Lc., our only parallel account (iv 34), copies Mc. literally: but I incline to think that the words should be constructed closely with what follows, and that Tisch. is right against W-H in printing it as a statement. *οἶδα* : *οἴδαμεν* (Tisch. and W-H margin) ℵ L Δ only among MSS, and only the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic among versions. So far the case seems clear: doubt arises only on two grounds, (i) that Luke has certainly *οἶδα*, (ii) that many fathers, Greek and Latin, have *οἴδαμεν* (scimus), and as they can hardly have found it in Luke, might be presumed to derive it from Mark. But apart from Origen derivation from Mark cannot be proved: and that Origen is once more in agreement with ℵ can cause no surprise. Internal evidence is neutral, if indeed it does not favour the singular (there is an equally curious alternation of plural and singular in Mark v 7–13), compare verse 25 *αὐτῷ . . . Φιμώθητι*. *οἴδαμεν* may well have arisen out of mere assimilation to the preceding plurals *ἡμῖν*, *ἡμᾶς*. 25. *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*: *ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* D W (Θ) Old Latins and vg., apparently by assimilation (which in most of the group extends further than this phrase) to Mc. v 8; yet *αὐτοῦ* may equally well have been borrowed from the parallel in Lc. iv 35. Tischendorf is in error if I understand him rightly as suggesting that 'de homine' in Latins suggests *ἀπό* rather than *ἐκ*: 'de' is the representation of *ἐκ* in the earliest Christian terminology, e. g. 'deum de deo' in the Nicene Creed. 26. *φωνῆσαν* ℵ B L 33 only: rightly, for if *κράξαν* had stood in the text, no one would have altered it. *φωνεῖν φωνῇ* seemed inappropriate in a *δαιμόνιον* (Luke transfers the noun to the man possessed, iv 33), though all four Gospels use the verb of the cock crowing. 27. *συνζητεῖν αὐτούς* ℵ B and the Old Latins *b e ff*; rightly, for *συνζητεῖν* is a rather favourite word of Mark's and his rule is to use it absolutely, viii 11, ix 10, xii 28 (in ix 14, 16 *συνζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτούς* is 'to discuss with them', i. e. the disciples, not 'with one another'): *συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτούς* the rest, influenced by the Lucan parallel *συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους*. *Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι κτλ.* Text ℵ B L 33 (Θ *fam.* 1): but Luke, and most scribes of Mark following Luke, make the three clauses into one. Mark is fond of such triple co-ordinate clauses, cf. i 24, ii 7, xiv 63, 64, xvi 6, one

ουσιν αὐτῷ. 28 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν
περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.
29 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ
Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάνου. 30 ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσ-
σουσα, καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς. 31 καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν
κρατήσας τῆς χειρός· καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. 32 ὀψίας
δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ⌜ἔδυσεν⌝ ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς
ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· 33 καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς
τὴν θύραν. 34 καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις,
καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν· καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν ⌜τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν⌝, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν
αὐτόν.
35 Καὶ πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον

32. ⌜ἔδυ⌝ 34. ⌜λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια⌝

of them at least (but never all of them) being interrogative. The central clause is generally the briefest, as ii 7 *βλασφημεῖ*, and one would like with W-H to punctuate after *καινή*: but verse 22 connects *κατ' ἐξουσίαν* with *διδαχῇ*, and I punctuate accordingly. 28. *πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας*: a redundant expression quite in Mark's style, but because redundant altered by Luke to *εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου*, and by most authorities in Mark by the omission of *πανταχοῦ*. Luke's *πάντα τόπον* shews that he read *πανταχοῦ* in Mark with ℵ^c B C L W *fam.* 13 *b e*.

29. *ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον* ℵ A C L Γ Δ vg. (*def.* sah) Tisch. W-H text, and so Marcan usage (*J. T. S.*, April 1925, xxvi 228): *ἐξελθὼν ἦλθεν* B W Θ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 (D Old Latins: *def. a*) with the singular of Matt. and Luke. The whole phrase in Mark is so odd that change was tempting: it inevitably suggests 'we left and came into our house with James and John' as the original from which it was derived. *Ἰωάνου* B D W-H: I follow this spelling which is almost universal in B D, and the agreement of our two most primitive MSS seems all but decisive. If indeed Hort were right in supposing that the spelling *Ἰωάνης* points to a Roman origin for B, the agreement would lose most of its force: but it is now universally, I think, admitted that B was written in Alexandria. 32. *ἔδυσεν* B D W-H: *ἔδυ* the rest and Tisch. *ἔδυ* is the older classical form, *ἔδυσεν* came into more frequent use later on. I follow B D, if with more hesitation than in the last note: in Lc. iv 40 D has *δύσαντος*, and Origen and most of the Latins bear witness to a past tense, so that the same aorist form may be genuine there as well. 34. *τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν* B, and the order is so far supported by Lc. (and D Θ and the Latins and syr-sin in Mc.) *αὐτὰ λαλεῖν*: *λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια* the rest with Tisch. W-H. *ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν* ℵ* A D etc., the Latins, syr-sin, Victor's catena, Tisch.: + *Χριστὸν* (or *τὸν Χρ.*) *εἶναι* ℵ^c B C L W Θ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 28 33, W-H text, from Lc. iv 41. A clear example of assimilation, to which most of our Alexandrian authorities, even the best, have succumbed.

35. *ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν* ('he left Capernaum and went away to a desert place'): *ἐξῆλθεν* only B 28 565, *ἀπῆλθεν* only W *b d e ff*. The double phrase is very Marcan, and either accidental omission of a line or a conscious intention to prune away the apparent redundancy will account for the reading of B: versions hardly count, for an early Latin translator e. g. might easily have contented himself with a single verb. But *a* syr-sin have two verbs. *κἀκεῖ* ℵ B C L Δ Θ, and so in verse 38 ℵ D L, xiv 15 ℵ D 565: *καὶ ἐκεῖ* the rest, but in xiv 15 many authorities have *ἐκεῖ* without *καί*. I incline to think that Mark may have been the more likely, scribes of Mark

κἀκεῖ προσηύχετο. [36] καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν ⌜Σίμων⌝ καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, [37] καὶ
εὗρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε. [38] καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
Ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα ⌜κἀκεῖ⌝ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο
γὰρ ἐξῆλθον. [39] καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν
Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.
[40] Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν,

36. ⌜ὅ τε Σίμων⌝ 38. ⌜καὶ ἐκεῖ⌝

the less likely, to prefer the contracted form. 36. κατεδίωξεν ℵ B Θ 28 vg.: rightly, for Mark is fond of a singular verb where mention of more than one person follows, e. g. iii 31 καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ (so ℵ D *fam.* 1 565 Old Latins), viii 27 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰ. καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (no variant), xiii 3 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν . . . ὁ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάνης καὶ Ἀνδρέας (again of Peter: so ℵ B L *fam.* 13 28 33). No doubt the singular contains the implication that the person first mentioned stands out from the rest. Σίμων ℵ B L W 33: ὅ τε Σίμων Θ *fam.* 1 28 (and presumably the archetype of D: D* has τε, D² τότε): ὁ Σίμων A C Δ and the mass of MSS. The article with Σίμων is so unusual that one looks about for a reason: and perhaps the reason may be found in the desire to emphasize the first name after the singular verb, see last note. I think therefore that it must at least be given a place in the margin. 37. καὶ εὗρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν ℵ B L *e*, and this is characteristically Marcan: καὶ ὅτε εὗρον αὐτὸν λέγουσιν D Latins (except *b c e*) syr-sin sah (but versions may be deferring to the idiom of their own language); καὶ εὑρόντες αὐτὸν λέγουσιν A C Δ Θ and the mass of MSS; λέγοντες alone W *b c*. The three verbs co-ordinated with καί presented an irresistible temptation to scribes to introduce a subordinate or participial construction. 38. ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις ℵ B C* L 33 Egyptian versions and arm: but (just as in verse 28 πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γ.) the adverb seemed redundant, and ἀλλαχοῦ is omitted by A C³ D W Δ Θ Latins and Syriac. κἀκεῖ: see on verse 35. ἐξῆλθον ℵ B C L Θ 33 sah (the meaning is 'I left Capernaum', referring back to verse 35): ἐξελήλυθα of A D etc., ἐλήλυθα of W Δ 28 *fam.* 13, are both probably derived from Jo. xviii 37 εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον. But *ueni* of the Latins must not be quoted for ἐλήλυθα: *eueni* could hardly be used in this sense. [It is possible that St Jerome wrote for ἄγωμεν . . . ἐξῆλθον 'exeamus . . . ueni'—that at least appears to be the reading of the St Gall MS—intending to represent the ἐξ- of the latter verb in his rendering of the former one.] 39. ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς σ. A C D W Δ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13: rightly, for this is good Marcan usage, see on verse 21; and the Latin and Syriac versions should be cited on this side, for both give 'was preaching', and if they render εἰς τὰς σ. 'in their synagogues' they could hardly do otherwise, since 'into their synagogues' would for them be nonsense: ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς ℵ B L Θ sah, improving the colloquial Greek of Mark.

40. παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν λέγων αὐτῷ, with *e* 'obsecrans eum et genibus uolutans dicens illi'. There are here one important and three less important variations: (1) are we to omit καὶ γονυπετῶν? (2) if not, are we to add αὐτόν after it? (3) are we to read λέγων or καὶ λέγων? (4) are we to omit αὐτῷ? Let us take them separately and in this order. (1) A very strong body of witnesses omit καὶ γονυπετῶν, B D W *a b c ff* and the Sahidic. But the words were in the copies of Mc. used by both Mt. προσεκύνει αὐτῷ and Lc. πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, and besides it would be very difficult to account for their insertion by ℵ A C L Δ Θ *fam.* 1 565 *e* syr-sin and the rest: whereas omission may have been due either to the desire to

λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐὰν θέλῃς, ⸂δύνῃ⸃ με καθαρίσαι. [41] καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Θέλω· καθαρίσθητι. [42] καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθερίσθη. [43] καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ

40. ⸂δύνασαι⸃

avoid so violent a word (note that both Mt. and Lc. have changed it here, just as they drop it in the passages parallel to Mc. x 17) or, perhaps more probably, by the accidental omission of a line in a very early copy of Mc.: the words καὶ γονυπετῶν do in fact occupy just a line in ℵ and Θ. (2) Of the authorities that preserve καὶ γονυπετῶν, A C Δ and others (versions hardly count here) add αὐτόν, and this is the normal construction, Mc. x 17, cf. Mt. xvii 14. But even Mc. might shrink from αὐτὸν . . . αὐτὸν . . . αὐτῷ in the limit of seven words, and we may suppose that the preceding αὐτόν is governed by both παρακαλῶν and γονυπετῶν. (3) καί before λέγων is omitted only by ℵ* B 69* *e* sah, but λέγων is not really parallel to the two preceding participles, and I suspect omission is right. (4) αὐτῷ is omitted only by D W, the Latins other than *e*, and sah: there are numerous cases up and down the Gospel, where after λέγει (λέγων) some good authority, even sometimes B, omits αὐτῷ (αὐτοῖς). It is often no doubt pleonastic, but that is no reason against it in Mc. [Compare for instance in the next verse λέγει αὐτῷ, where ℵ W *fam.* 1 *c ff* omit αὐτῷ, with Mt. and Lc., as redundant, against A B C D Θ and the best Latins. Inadequate as the omitting authorities are—clear as Marcan usage is—Tisch. follows them.] Note then that the 'African' Latin, represented by *e*, is the only text that in all four points gives what seems to be the right reading. δύνῃ B: δύνασαι the rest, with the parallel passages in Mt. (viii 2) and Lc. (v 12), and so too Mt. v 36, Lc. vi 42, Jo. xiii 36. Apart from Lc. xvi 2, the only books of N.T. where δύνῃ is found are Mc. (ix 22, 23), Apoc. (ii 2), and also Hermas: see Blass *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* [1896, p. 48], § 23. 2. Clearly therefore it was the more vulgar or colloquial form, and likely to be used by Mc.; and as B is re-inforced in ix 22, 23 by ℵ D Δ *fam.* 1 28, I feel little hesitation in following it here, even W-H desert it. 41. ὀργισθείς D *a ff r*: *b* omits: σπλαγχνισθείς the rest. The considerations that here dictate decision are: (1) If σπλαγχνισθείς were original, it is hardly conceivable that any scribe should have substituted ὀργισθείς: (2) Mt. and Lc. have nothing corresponding to either word; they had a strong motive for omitting ὀργισθείς, just as they both omit ἐμβριμησάμενος of verse 43, and μετ' ὀργῆς of iii 5, but there was none for omitting σπλαγχνισθείς. (3) ἐμβριμησάμενος of verse 43 shews that there was, in the working of this miracle, for whatever reason, indignation on our Lord's part against the man, perhaps because of his doubt of the will to heal, ἐὰν θέλῃς. ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο ℵ B L: ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο αὐτοῦ D: ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ the rest, with Mt and Lc. Versions could hardly avoid the natural rendering 'stretched out his hand and touched him', and D, the only authority which gives a Greek that corresponds to this, has presumably Latinized here. But our other Greek witnesses, though they are divided into two camps over the position of αὐτοῦ, mean all of them to connect αὐτοῦ with ἥψατο. τὴν χεῖρα is the Greek for our 'his hand' (so Mc. iii 5, where W-H, wrongly I think, desert B to read τὴν χεῖρά σου, v 23, vi 5, vii 3, vii 32, viii 23, 25, ix 43 τὰς δύο χεῖρας 'your two hands', x 16, xiv 46): would not τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ be the other man's hand? As between αὐτοῦ ἥψατο and ἥψατο αὐτοῦ, ℵ B L are shewn to be right by Marcan usage, see iii 10, (v 30), v 31, viii 22, x 13 (vi 56 would be an exception, but *a b ff i* omit αὐτοῦ): Mt. and Lc. habitually put αὐτοῦ after ἅπτεσθαι. αὐτῷ: see on verse 40. 42. ἐκαθερίσθη A B* C L Δ 1 (cf. τεσσεράκοντα in i 13, where also

εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, [44] καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ὅρα μηδενὶ [μηδὲν] εἴπῃς, ἀλλ' ὕπαγε, σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. [45] ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι [αὐτὸν] δύνασθαι ⸢εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς⸣ εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔξω ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις [ἦν· καὶ] ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν παντόθεν.

45. ⸢φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν⸣

the second hand of B substitutes the more correct form): a solecism for ἐκαθαρίσθη, perhaps genuine only in Mc. 44. μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς B C Θ and the mass of Greek MSS: μηδενὶ εἴπῃς ℵ A D L W Δ 33 (*fam.* 13) Latins sah, with Mt. and Lc. On the one side we have Mc.'s tendency to pleonasm: on the other side the parallels in Mc. vii 36, viii 26 (where the true text has μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην), viii 30; I think the longer reading is right. 45. αὐτὸν δύνασθαι εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς: the order of these words varies in a puzzling way in the MSS, but (i) αὐτόν is omitted by D W, and, if omission is right, we can understand why ℵ inserts αὐτόν after δύνασθαι and the rest before δύνασθαι: (ii) the order εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς ought to be correct, for the emphasis is rather on εἰς πόλιν than on φανερῶς; but desire on the part of scribes to avoid the hiatus δύνασθαι εἰς may perhaps account for the change in A B W Δ Θ etc. to δύνασθαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν. ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις ℵ B L W Δ (*fam.* 13) 28: ἐπί is changed to ἐν by the other MSS and by Lc. The more unusual preposition is doubtless right: but ἐπί c. dat. in a local sense meaning neither 'on' nor 'at' is unusual, and I know of no exact parallel in N.T. Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. cite however from a papyrus (140 B.C.) ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ ἐπὶ χώρᾳ. ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο: *b e* omit ἦν καί, and it is possible to translate their reading 'they came to him outside the city in the open country from all sides': B omits ἦν retaining καί, which seems untranslateable, though W-H give B's reading a place in the margin.

Variations of the text above printed from the text or margin of Westcott and Hort.

i 1 υἱοῦ θεοῦ (so W-H margin): *om.* W-H text 6. δέρριν: W-H τρίχας with my margin καμήλου: W-H *add.* καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ with my margin 11. φωνή: W-H *add.* [ἐγένετο] 14. μετὰ δέ: W-H καὶ μετά with my margin [τῆς βασιλείας]: *om.* W-H 15. λέγων: W-H [καὶ λέγων] with my margin 21. ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν (so W-H margin): W-H text εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν 22. ἔχων, οὐχ: W-H ἔχων καὶ οὐχ 25. λέγων: W-H [λέγων] 27. αὐτούς (so W-H text): πρὸς ἑαυτούς W-H margin 29. ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον (ἐξελθόντες ἦλθαν W-H text): W-H margin ἐξελθὼν ἦλθεν 34. τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν: W-H λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια with my margin ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν: W-H *add.* [Χριστὸν εἶναι] 35. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν: W-H [καὶ ἀπῆλθεν] 38. κἀκεῖ: W-H καὶ ἐκεῖ with my margin 39. ἦν κηρύσσων: W-H ἦλθεν κηρύσσων 40. καὶ γονυπετῶν: W-H [καὶ γονυπετῶν] δύνῃ: W-H δύνασαι with my margin 41. ὀργισθείς (so W-H margin): W-H text σπλαγχνισθείς 45. εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς (so W-H margin): W-H text φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν with my margin [ἦν καί]: W-H [ἦν] καί In all, sixteen differences between my text and that of W-H: but in six of these the margin of W-H agrees with my text, and in eight their text agrees with my margin.

C. H. TURNER.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1927

NOTES AND STUDIES

WESTERN READINGS IN THE SECOND HALF OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL.

THE reason for dealing here with the second half of the Gospel only is simply that this is the part of the Gospel for which we have the evidence of *k*: in other words, the Western evidence for the text is here at its best and strongest. The textual theory of the Gospels which I propounded in the January number of *J. T. S.* (pp. 145–149) involves, if it is justified, the modification of our critical editions by the acceptance of at least a certain number of readings on Western authority only: and in chapter i as there printed purely Western readings were in fact adopted in the text on three occasions and into the margin twice.

The object of the present paper being to reinforce the plea for further consideration of Western readings in St Mark by examining a number of them in succession, it is natural to begin at the point where Western evidence can be presented in the most favourable light. And of *k* we know this, that it gives us the Gospel text which Cyprian used in Africa in the middle of the third century.

But before proceeding to the details of the enquiry it may serve the reader's convenience to have before him a conspectus of the lacunae in our principal authorities.

k is extant for St Mark from viii 8 onwards, save for two small gaps, viii 11–14, 16–19.

From viii 8 to the end of the Gospel Θ and syr-sin are complete.

D is complete as far as xvi 6 Lat., xvi 15 Gr. In other words, that possessor of the MS who wanted to separate from the rest the portion containing the Catholic Epistles as a whole was obliged to take out a leaf containing on the *recto* the Latin of xvi 6–15, and on the *verso* the Greek of xvi 15–20, because the *verso* in question contained also the commencement of the Greek text of the Catholic Epistles.

W is complete, save for the ante-penultimate leaf containing xv 12–38.

e has nothing in this half of Mark but four isolated columns of text (apparently the inner halves of two, probably conjugate, leaves), containing xii 37–40, xiii 2, 3; xiii 24–27, 33–36.

a has lost from xv 15 onwards.

b has lost everything from xiv 61, and nearly everything from xiii 10, onwards.

ff has lost parts of ix 17–33, xvi 15–20.

i has lost x 2–33, xiv 36–xv 33, xv 40–end.

1. viii 26 Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς (I put in each case Westcott and Hort's text first). In *J. T. S.* xxvi p. 18 (Oct. A.D. 1924) I discussed this reading, and shewed that the process of analysis could be carried a stage further back than Hort had carried it: for 'Marcan usage', εἰς for ἐν, points to Μηδὲ (or Μηδενὶ) εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην as the original reading. No Greek authority gives that and nothing more, though D has in fact Μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην as part of its reading: but *k* has 'nemini dixeris in castello' and *c* is even nearer to the true Greek with 'ne cui diceret in castellum'. Read therefore **Μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην**.

2. viii 38 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, and so Luke ix 26 (with ἂν for ἐάν). Now in Luke the best 'Western' authorities there extant omit λόγους: so D *a e l* syr-sin.[1] But it has been (so far as I know) a factor hitherto unnoticed that the same omission is attested for St Mark by two of our oldest and best Westerns, *k* W. What are we to say? Is λόγους right in both Gospels? or is omission right in both? or, what is *a priori* perhaps the most probable view, is omission right in one Gospel, insertion in the other? But if we adopt this third view, we must certainly attribute the shorter reading to Mark, the longer to Luke: it would surely be incredible that Luke should have omitted λόγους if he had found it in the text of Mark.

Anyhow it is not our business to settle the text of Luke: it is enough to say that if τοὺς ἐμούς (without λόγους) is right in Luke, that is in itself strong testimony to the same reading being right in Mark. But let us suppose that τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους is right in Luke: whence in that case did D *a e l* syr-sin derive the shorter reading but ultimately from Mark, even though the existing text of Mark in all of them (but *e* is not extant for Mark) gives λόγους?

Next what has 'intrinsic probability' got to tell us as between the two readings in St Mark? There is, on the one hand, very little about our Lord's sayings, as such, in Mark: apart from this passage the only two occasions on which the phrase οἱ λόγοι is found are x 24 and xiii 31, while in Luke it occurs at least half a dozen times. On the other

[1] Origen *Exhortatio ad Martyrium* 34, 37 quotes the Lucan passage both with and without the word λόγους.

hand, St. Mark's Gospel does I think definitely distinguish itself from the others by its special expression of the thought that the Lord and the disciples form a single group: compare, for instance, the 'follows not us' of Mark ix 38 with the 'follows not with us' of Luke ix 49, and see generally Mark ix 37, 41, 42, x 39. The reading ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμούς is naturally strange to us at first: but I venture to think that it corresponds more closely than the alternative to the conceptions that are dominant in this part of St Mark's Gospel.

3. ix 5 *καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς*. So, save for the inversion of *σκηνὰς τρεῖς*[1], Luke ix 33: Matt. xvii 4 has, on the other hand, *εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω*[2] *ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς*, and how are we to account for *εἰ θέλεις*? Now D Θ *fam* 13 565 *b ff i* have in Mark not *καὶ ποιήσωμεν* but *θέλεις ποιήσωμεν* (*ποιήσω* D *b ff i*), and if that is right the text of Mark stands midway between the texts of Matthew and Luke, and accounts for both. It is true that *k* gives *bonum est nobis hic est* | *set faciamus*, which probably stands for *hic esse et*, i. e. the ordinary reading: W *καὶ θέλεις ποιήσω δέ*, *a* too *esse* ** *si uis f****mus*, though their texts are mixed, recognize *θέλεις*. With *k* and syr-sin supporting ℵ B, the results are not as clear as one would wish: but D W Θ *fam* 13 565 *a b ff i* are a strong group, and to my mind the balance is in favour of θέλεις ποιήσωμεν as (i) giving a good Marcan construction, cf x 36, 51, xiv 12, xv 9, 12, (ii) improving the sense, (iii) accounting for the form given to the sentence by Matthew.

4. ix 18 *ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ ῥήσσει αὐτόν*. The verb *ῥήσσω* is a collateral form of *ῥήγνυμι*: but it cannot be said that 'breaks' or 'tears' gives a tolerable sense, and L.S. quotes no authority for the sense we want here save this passage only. Obviously the meaning must be 'dashes to the ground' (Euthymius *ἀντὶ τοῦ* καταβάλλει εἰς γῆν, quoted by Swete), and we are thrown back on the Western reading *ῥάσσει*: so D 565 with *collidit k*, *allidit b i*, *elidit* (ut uid) *ff*, and presumably syr-sin 'casteth him down'. *ῥάσσω* is a collateral form of *ἀράσσω*: it is found some eight times in LXX, and Thackeray *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek* i p. 76 (I owe the reference to Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. *ῥήγνυμι*) points out that it is 'the LXX form of *ἀράσσω* . . . not an alternative for *ῥήσσω ῥήγνυμι*': generally in a metaphorical sense, but in Dan. viii 10 LXX gives *ἐρράχθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* where Theodotion has *ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*. The Concordance shews that the word was either unfamiliar or suspect as colloquial, for on two or three occasions it is in some authorities omitted or altered: even the classical

[1] The Western text has *τρεῖς σκηνάς*, but that may perhaps be an assimilation to Matthew and Mark.

[2] Again the Western text (with the mass of authorities) has *ποιήσωμεν*, but once more we may be in presence of an assimilation to Mark and Luke.

form ἀράσσω is hardly ever found in prose writers, though 'it was certainly employed in everyday life' (Rutherford *The New Phrynichus* p. 6). Hermas *Mand.* xi 3 εἴ τινα δυνήσεται ῥάξαι τῶν δικαίων offers an instructive parallel to the passage in Mark—the more instructive that Hermas, like Mark, wrote in Rome and wrote the Greek of everyday life—for the editors print ῥῆξαι, as indeed Clement's text has it, *Strom.* i 17. 85 (Stählin ii p. 55), though the Athos MS has ῥάξαι and the Latin versions respectively *deiciet* and *adlidat*. I have therefore no hesitation in accepting the testimony of the Western authorities in Mark and replacing ῥάσσει in the text.

5. ix 19 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς . . . But καί for ὁ δέ in D W Θ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 565 O.L.: and the ἀποκριθεὶς δέ of Matthew and Luke is more likely to have arisen out of the Western reading, since the substitution of δέ for καί is a regular feature of their re-handling of Mark, while ὁ δέ of Mark is left standing fifteen times by Matthew, eleven times by Luke. I do not think I have noticed any instance where both change ὁ δέ of Mark.

6. ix 38 εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν. So Luke ix 49 (save that for the two words last quoted he has ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν), and so in Mark (apart from the two words in question) ℵ B C L Δ Θ syr-sin. We are concerned on this occasion only with the order of the clauses; not with the tenses of ἐκωλύομεν and ἠκολούθει, and not with the variation ἡμῖν, μεθ' ἡμῶν, of which ἡμῖν is certainly right in Mark, μεθ' ἡμῶν in Luke. But the Western text of Mark omits the ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει clause at the end of the verse, and inserts it, with ὅς for ὅτι, after ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια in the first half of the verse: so D W *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 565 *a b c ff i k* vg arm. Both readings are combined in the Syrian text ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν. Quite clearly this last reading is conflate, and we have to choose between the other two, one of which is practically identical with Luke. For myself I feel no doubt at all that the Western reading is original in Mark, that Luke transferred the clause ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ to what seemed a more logical place for it at the end of the verse as the reason why the disciples 'forbade him', and that the Alexandrian reading represents an assimilation of the text of Mark to the more logical arrangement of the clauses in Luke. Read therefore in Mark **εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν.**

7. x 1 συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν. The word ὄχλος is found thirty-seven times in Mark, and this is the only occasion on which the plural occurs. When writing in the JOURNAL for April 1925 (xxvi 237, 'Notes on Marcan usage: § V The movements of Jesus and

his disciples and the crowd') I tried to account for the exceptional use of the plural as perhaps emphasizing 'the numbers who collected from different directions on the journey through Peraea': but in fact there is no exception to account for. συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος is the reading of D Θ 565, συνπορεύεται ὁ ὄχλος of W, *conuenit turba* (with or without *rursus* or *iterum*) of *b c ff i k*,[1] 'there went again unto him a multitude' of syr-sin. Of the two verbs συνέρχομαι is found in two other places in St Mark (iii 20, xiv 53), συνπορεύομαι nowhere else in N.T. save in St Luke. The plural ὄχλοι is amply accounted for as an intrusion from the parallel in Matt. xix 2 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί: and once more we follow the Westerns and Marcan usage with **συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς αὐτόν.**

8. x 2 καὶ [προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι] ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. The words which W-H here enclose in brackets have again come in from Matt. xix 3 καὶ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι: they are omitted by D *a b k* syr-sin, while *ff* has only *quidam*, and *i* is defective. See, for further discussion of the reading, my *Study of the New Testament: 1883 and 1920*, p. 60.

9. x 9 ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. So in identical words Matt. xix 6. But D *k* in Mark omit οὖν, and are borne out by Marcan usage. As I have shewn at length in a recent number of *J. T. S.* (xxviii 20, October 1926) οὖν is common in Matthew, extraordinarily rare in Mark. I have no doubt that it has been transferred from the passage of Matthew into the text of most authorities of the passage of Mark, and that we shall be right in following the two authorities which omit and in reading **ὃ ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν . . .**

10. x 19 ΜΗ ΦΟΝΕΥCΗC, ΜΗ ΜΟΙΧΕΥCΗC, ΜΗ ΚΛΕΨΗC. This order of the Commandments is the order of Matt. xix 18 and of the texts, Greek and Hebrew, of O.T., and is suspect for that very reason. Both the parallel text of Luke (xviii 20) and the catalogue in Mark vii 21 diverge, Luke only by inverting the Sixth and Seventh Commandments, Mark vii 21 by adding πορνεῖαι to μοιχεῖαι. When then we find that D *k* Iren. (for Iren. see *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*, 1923, p. 251) agree in omitting μὴ φονεύσῃς and in adding μὴ πορνεύσῃς, the very unexpectedness of the reading gives it a claim for hearing. Mark's list is independent of the ordinary tradition—the presence of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς further on is proof enough of that: the Vaticanus represents a forcible assimilation to Matthew or O.T., witness its ejection of the certainly genuine μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. We shall therefore once more, if more tentatively than on other occasions, still award the preference to the reading of three good Western authorities **μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ πορνεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς.**[2]

[1] The text of *a* at this point cannot now be deciphered with certainty: but Bianchini read *turba ad illum* in the singular.

[2] For further discussion I may perhaps be allowed to refer to my Commentary on Mark *ad loc.* in the forthcoming S.P.C.K. Bible Commentary.

11. x 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά with Matt. xix 22. But χρήματα is given for κτήματα in Mark by D *a b ff k*[1] syr-sin Clem. Al. *Quis diues saluetur* 4 § 7 (*b k* Clem. Al. add καὶ ἀγρούς, but I am not concerned with that addition at the moment): and it is rendered, I think, practically certain by *v.* 23, where the phrase is taken up again with οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες (so too Luke xviii 24). The ordinary texts have again been corrupted from Matthew: Mark used the same word χρήματα in both verses 22 and 23.

12. x 29 ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα . . . So B C W Δ Θ 565 syr-sin: and in the inverse order ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ℵ A with Matt. xix 29: ἢ μητέρα alone D *a ff k* (*def. i*). It seems to me all but certain that the latter reading is right. But it may be best to open the discussion by reducing the alternatives to two, and setting aside the reading ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα: if this had been original no one would have altered it, while its appearance in some MSS of Mark is amply accounted for either as the restitution of the common order 'father or mother', or as a direct transference from the parallel passage in Matt. xix 29. The issue lies really between the other two readings: and the considerations that seem to me decisive in favour of the Western reading are the following: (i) in all other points *v.* 30 is modelled on, and exactly reproduces, *v.* 29, 'home or brethren or sisters or mother [or father] or children or lands', 'homes and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands'—in *v.* 30 the evidence for 'and fathers' is wholly negligible: (ii) the order 'mother or father' seems unique in the Greek Bible, Old and New Testament alike: (iii) the omission of 'father' is no doubt at first sight odd, but may it not be that our Lord begins with His own case, which He transfers naturally enough to His followers—He had left 'home and brethren and sisters and mother': (iv) if 'mother' alone was original, and 'or father' was at a very early point added over the line, it would be an open chance whether the adventitious words were incorporated in the next copy before or after the 'or mother' of the evangelist's text. Read therefore ἢ μητέρα alone.

13. xi 31 Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ . . . So the critical texts with Matthew and Luke: but the Westerns D *a b c ff i k*, supported by the Easterns Θ Φ *fam* 13 28 565 700, prefix Τί εἴπωμεν; and that seems so entirely to correspond to the style of the Gospel that it is difficult not to believe it genuine. The other Synoptists may have independently suppressed the question as superfluous; or one or other of them may already have found it absent from his text of Mark. A line of nine letters ΤΙ ΕΙΠΩΜΕΝ; might easily have dropped out if the scribe's eye wandered on to the next line ending with εἴπωμεν also.

[1] In spite of Tischendorf's note *ad loc.* it seems to me certain that *diuitias* of *k* represents χρήματα, not κτήματα: *diuitias* recurs in *v.* 23, where the Greek has χρήματα without variant. And he wrongly cites Clem. Al. for κτήματα.

14. xi 32 ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάνην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. Matt. xxi 26 πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάνην, cf. xiv 5 ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον, xxi 46 εἰς [*v. l.* ὡς] προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. Mark nowhere else uses ἔχω (fond as he is of the verb) in this sense: Matthew, as just quoted, does so twice. Thus there is proof that it is Matthaean use, none that it is Marcan: moreover Matthew's construction ἔχειν ὡς (or εἰς) προφήτην, 'reckon him for a prophet', is natural enough; not so Mark's ἔχειν ὄντως. But εἰδέναι ὄντως, 'to know of a truth', is as natural as ἔχειν ὄντως is the opposite: and D W Θ 565 *a b c ff i k* arm have ᾔδεισαν τὸν Ἰωάνην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. That seems to me right: the rest, as so often, have borrowed from Matthew. I think too that Luke's πεπεισμένος ἐστίν (xx 6) is rather a paraphrase of ᾔδεισαν ὄντως than of εἶχον ὄντως.

15. xii 6 ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτούς with ℵ B C L Δ Θ *fam* 13 33: πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔσχατον A W vg etc.: ἔσχατον (without πρὸς αὐτούς) D 1071 *a ff i k*. Now if we look at the context we shall find that in *v.* 2 Mark has πρὸς τοὺς γεωργούς followed by Matthew and Luke: in *v.* 4 he has πρὸς αὐτούς, where both Matthew and Luke omit: in *v.* 5 (omitted by Matthew) Mark and Luke have nothing, and in *v.* 6 (the verse under discussion) Luke again has nothing. In other words Luke has πρὸς (αὐτούς) on the first occasion, but not again: Matthew has it on the first occasion, but not again till the last. Those are, from a literary point of view, both obvious and natural arrangements. Though there is less in Mark of conscious literary writing, I should like to give him the credit of the simple straightforwardness of ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον, which quite disappears if we prefer to read αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτούς. Add the considerations that πρὸς αὐτούς can be validly explained as a borrowing from Matthew, and that it is inserted in different places by different authorities, and I think the presumption in favour of the Westerns attains considerable proportions.

16. xii 14 ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον . . .; and similarly (without variant) in Matt. xxii 17. But in Mark ἐπικεφάλαιον (*capitularium*) is given in place of κῆνσον in D Θ 124 (one of the best representatives of *fam* 13) 565 1071 *k*: W has neither word in the text, but κῆνσον is written over Καίσαρι by perhaps the original scribe: *a b ff i* have *tributum*, but as *b* and *ff* render κῆνσον by *censum* in Matt. xxii 17, it seems likely that they did not read κῆνσον in Mark.[1] Decision is very difficult: for our natural instinct would be to treat the Latin word κῆνσος as one of Mark's many Latinisms, and moreover, though the Jews did pay a poll-tax to Caesar after A.D. 70, it does not seem that they did so at an earlier date: the taxes, whether direct or indirect, did not, apparently,

[1] It is true that Vulg. has *censum* in Matt., *tributum* in Mark, but St Jerome has probably just followed his Old Latin model.

include a poll-tax. I am not sure that I should feel justified in putting ἐπικεφάλαιον into the text, though I am quite sure that *capitularium* was the earliest Latin rendering of whatever word stood then in the Greek text of Mark used in Rome.

17. xii 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; So both Matthew and Luke: and in Mark ℵ B C D L W Δ 28 33 and *c k*: a very strong combination, about the strongest combination anywhere in the Gospels in favour of a reading quite certainly wrong. But after ἀναστάσει the words ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν are added in A Θ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 565 and the mass of Greek MSS, *a b ff i* and Vulg. in Latin, syr-sin and arm. The presence of A and the mass of MSS on this side only means, of course, that the Syrian reviser found the words in one of his authorities, and so elected to retain them according to his regular preference—a preference no doubt usually wrong—for the longer reading. Apart from the Syrian text, however, we have one branch of the Western text, and the best authorities for the Eastern text, as against the Alexandrian text and D *k* of the Westerns: but we have also, what is decisive, the whole weight of Marcan usage. Cf. in xiii 19 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός, xiii 20 διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο, and note that in both these cases Matthew (there are no strict parallels here in Luke) omits the second half of the phrase. We could have predicted with confidence that if Mark wrote ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν, the other Synoptists would have pruned away the redundancy, as they have in other cases too many to recapitulate. Further ground for admitting ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν into the text of Mark in *v.* 23 is supplied by the echo of the phrase in *v.* 25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, where Matthew and Luke, having both suppressed ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν above, both substitute the noun ἀνάστασις. That scribes invented the words in *v.* 23 is a far less reasonable proposition than that scribes omitted them under the influence of Matthew and Luke. And we are therefore face to face with the unwelcome conclusion that the agreement of the Alexandrians with the best Westerns is not necessarily right: see also no. **22** below.

18. xiii 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ. So both the Alexandrian and the Eastern texts, and so with but small variation Matthew and Luke. But the whole Western group, D W *a b c e ff i k* Cyprian, add καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν. These words, whether genuine or no, are clearly not independent of xiv 58 ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω or (as the Westerns have it) ἀναστήσω. It is true that xiv 58 was the evidence of 'false witnesses', but it is clear from the evidence of the Gospels (cf. Acts vi 14) that our Lord *had* prophesied the destruc-

tion of the Temple; it is clear that the Jews believed that He had also spoken of its being raised or built again after an interval of 'three days', Mark xv 29; and it is clear that Christians too believed that He had used in connexion with His Death and Resurrection the phraseology 'after three days' or 'at an interval of three days' or 'on the third day'. Had He not only done this but brought both predictions, the destruction of the Temple and His own Resurrection, into juxtaposition with one another? It is not impossible, perhaps not even improbable: but it is another question whether St Mark had recorded such a double prediction at this point. If he had recorded it, it is not easy to see why both Matthew and Luke should have omitted it. That is the reason which inclines me on the whole to reject the words as an addition, though of course an early addition, to the text of Mark.

19. xiii 15 *ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἆραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ.* So ℵ B L Ψ and the Sahidic: both Western and Eastern texts insert after *καταβάτω* the words *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν*, and the insertion was adopted by the Syrian revision, the authorities in support being A D W Θ etc *a ff i* syr-sin. Tischendorf wrongly cites *k* on the side of omission: it reads *et qui in tecto est non descendat auferre aliquit de domo*, and therefore omits not only *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν* but *μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω*, obviously by *homoeoteleuton* whether in its ultimate Greek or in its proximate Latin ancestor (*descendat . . . introeat*), and there is so far nothing to shew whether it would have read *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν* or no: it must, as far as that issue is concerned, be simply put aside. But the supposition that the words are genuine explains the phenomena much better than the converse: (i) the reduplication *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν . . . ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας* is thoroughly Marcan, see on no. **17**; (ii) it would again be in accord with Matthew's usage to omit one of the two synonymous *οἰκία* phrases—he gives only *μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ*; (iii) omission of *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν* may have been due either to partial assimilation to Matthew, or to the accidental omission of a line; (iv) *μὴ καταβάτω* as an independent sentence is really nonsense, for the man on the house-top is bound to 'come down', whether or no he goes into the house. On all grounds, then, read **μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἆραί τι** (or **τι ἆραι**) **ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ.**

20. xiii 22 *ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα.* So Matthew with the addition of *μεγάλα* after *σημεῖα*. But in Mark *ψευδόχριστοι καί* is omitted by D 124 (i.e. *fam* 13?) *i k*, and *ποιήσουσιν* is read for *δώσουσιν* by D Θ *fam* 13 28 565 *a*. About the latter variation it needs only to be said that *ποιεῖν σημεῖον* is so common a collocation that it is more likely to have been substituted for *δοῦναι σημεῖον* than *vice versa*. As to *ψευδόχριστοι καί* it is obvious that

it might easily have been lost by *homoeoarcton*, and that may be the true explanation. Yet in the Apocalypse (xix 20) it is the 'false prophet who does signs . . . by which he deceived', and in Matt. xxiv 11 we find πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν πολλούς. That is probably an expansion of Matthew's own as a pendant to the 'many who shall come in my name, saying I am the Christ, and shall deceive many' of *v.* 5: and it suggests that Matt. had definitely in mind a parallelism between 'false Christs' and 'false prophets'. Note also that in *v.* 24 he has altered the ἐγερθήσονται δέ of Mark to ἐγερθήσονται γάρ. In other words, Mark is there passing on to a fresh point, Matthew is giving the reason for a point he has made already. Without dogmatizing in such a case I incline to think that in Mark *v.* 21 deals with false Christs, *v.* 22 only with false prophets, and that the Western group, small as it is, is right, while the rest have followed Matthew.

21. xiv 22–24 καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου . . . It will be noticed that the structure of the two halves of this account is not homogeneous, and comparison with Matt. xxvi 26–28 shews that in the Institution of the Bread the two Gospels are closely parallel, but that in the Institution of the Cup Mark has the statement of the fact that they drank instead of the command to drink. Now in *k*, though in no other authority, the two halves of the Marcan account are strictly homogeneous, and *v.* 22 is constructed on the same lines as *v.* 23: *accepit panem et benedixit et fregit et dedit illis et manducauerunt ex illo omnes et dixit illis Hoc est corpus meum*, or in Greek **λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔφαγον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.** That I believe to be what St Mark wrote. See my *Study of the New Testament, 1883 and 1920*, ed. 2 (1924) p. 70.

22. xiv 65 καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Προφήτευσον. But D *a* syr-sin[1] read only ἐμπτύειν τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν κτλ., and so Matt. xxvi 67 ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν . . . If Matthew had found the words περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον in the text of Mark, why in the world should he have omitted them? That consideration of course does not carry us all the way. If however we look at Luke xxii 64 we see at once the point of the veiling of the face, καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες Προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε, But that can hardly be the meaning of Προφήτευσον in Mark, for there is no suggestion of the question 'Who

[1] Traces of the reading of D *a* syr-sin are found also in Θ 565 arm: see Dr Streeter's *Four Gospels*, p. 326.

is it that struck thee?' And I do not doubt that Wellhausen is right in seeing a reference to the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple (xiv 58, cf. xv 29), so that the meaning is simply 'Give us more prophecies': Luke, on the other hand, perhaps drawing on other sources, interpreted the 'Prophesy' in a different sense, and inserted the veiling to account for his interpretation. If that be so, omission by D *a* syr-sin (and Matthew) has strong claims to be regarded as original in Mark. Note, as in no. **17**, the combination of Western and Eastern witnesses against the Alexandrians and *k*: I do not think we ever find *k* with Easterns against Alexandrians and European Westerns.

23. xv 25 *ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.* If these words are genuine we can only render them 'Now it was the third hour when they crucified him', since the fact of the Crucifixion has been already noted in *v.* 24. And it would cause us no surprise that Matthew and Luke, not being interested in notes of time, should omit the words. Only they do not simply omit them: both follow up the casting of lots over the clothes with a more or less equivalent notice, Matt. xxvii 36 *καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ*, Luke xxiii 35 *a* *καὶ ἱστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν* But in all this part of the story Matthew is following Mark with quite extraordinary closeness: and so we should expect to find something here in Mark which accounts for Matthew—better still if we find something so put that it would account not only for the phrase of Matthew but also for the phrase of Luke. And in fact the Western text of Mark gives *ἐφύλασσον* in place of *ἐσταύρωσαν*: so D *ff k n r*[1] (W *a i* being all three defective here): and *ἐφύλασσον* would quite easily suggest the *ἐτήρουν* of Matthew.[2] *τηρεῖν* is a favourite word with Matthew in this part of his Gospel (see xxvii 54, xxviii 4), and he has probably substituted it for the vaguer word *φυλάσσειν*. But he has correctly interpreted the sense of Mark if *ἐφύλασσον* was what Mark wrote: if *ἐσταύρωσαν* is right in Mark, Matthew has introduced a new idea. It is not so easy to be sure that Luke is really parallel to Mark at this point: but it is at least possible that he interpreted *ἐφύλασσον* as an impersonal plural 'people were watching him' in the sense of 'looking on at him', and cleared up any ambiguity by inserting *ὁ λαός* as the subject of the sentence. Anyhow the evidence of Matthew is in my belief sufficient to make it probable that he found *ἐφύλασσον* in the text of Mark, and I should therefore read **ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐφύλασσον αὐτόν.**

[1] *n* is the symbol for some St Gall leaves of the fifth or sixth century, the text being very close to that of *a*, edited by White in *Old Latin Biblical Texts* II, 1886: *r* is a Gospel MS of the sixth century preserved at Dublin and edited by T. K. Abbott *Evangeliorum Versio Antehieronymiana*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1884.

[2] So Tischendorf *ad loc.* on *ἐφύλασσον* (though he does not give it in his text), 'quae lectio egregie commendatur conlato Mt xxvii 36'.

24. xv 34 *a* Ἐλωί ἐλωί λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί; But it is very difficult to think that this can represent the words used by our Lord, for how could the form Ἐλωί possibly have been confused with anything like Ἠλείας? Ἠλί (Ἠλεί), that is to say, the Hebrew form not the Aramaic, must certainly be original, and it is in itself much more likely that our Lord in His dying cry from the Psalm would have used the sacred language rather than any Aramaic rendering. Now the Hebrew form is actually given here by D Θ 131 (that is *fam* 1) 565 *c i k n* arm and Eusebius (*demonstratio evangelica* x 8, citing Mark by name), and I cannot hesitate for a moment in restoring to Mark the words Ἠλεί Ἠλεί λαμὰ ζαφθανεί; With our larger knowledge of the Synoptic problem it is, if one of the two Gospels gave a Hebrew and one an Aramaic wording, much the more probable that it was Mark who gave the original, Matthew the altered and more generally intelligible, form.

25. xv 34 *b* εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; So all authorities, save one Greek and three Latin MSS. But D has ὠνείδισάς με, *k* has *maledixisti me*,[1] *i* has *me in opprobrium dedisti*, *c* has *exprobrasti me*: it is quite impossible that any scribe should have invented this reading, while the ordinary text is amply accounted by the combined influence of the LXX of Ps. xxi (xxii) 1 and Matt. xxvii 46. Read therefore εἰς τί ὠνείδισάς με;

26. xv 39 ἰδὼν δὲ ... ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν. A very complicated case: and presumably Matthew and Luke either found some difficulty in the text of Mark, or else regarded it as mere reduplication of *v.* 37 ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν, for the former has ἰδόντες ... τὰ γινόμενα, the latter ἰδὼν ... τὸ γενόμενον. οὕτως, though omitted by W Θ 565 syr-sin arm, is given by both the Alexandrian and the Western texts, ℵ A B C D L *c ff i k n*, and must surely be genuine. But for the ἐξέπνευσεν of ℵ B L, ἔκραξεν alone is represented by *k*, κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν by A C (D) W Θ 565 syr-sin arm and all Old Latins but *k*. The latter reading looks like a combination of the other two, and I am not sure that οὕτως ἔκραξεν (*sic exclamauit*[2]) of *k* does not best explain the genesis of the alternatives. In the first place κράζω has very strong

[1] We owe to Prof. Burkitt the detection of the original reading of *k*. It may be noted here that *maledicere* is used in the *Actus Petri cum Simone*, ed. Lipsius 61. 14, 71. 18 (and probably 55. 23, where the MS gives *malo dixit*), with the meaning 'bitterly reproach' rather than 'curse', and the Greek verb of the original was very likely ὀνειδίζειν.

[2] It did occur to me to wonder whether *exclamauit* could be a rendering of the simple verb ἔκραξεν, and whether, in the ancestor of *k*, *clamans* could have been added by a correcting hand over *exspirauit*, and that the scribe of the copy took the addition as a substitution and so produced *exclamauit*. But in fact κράζω is represented in *k* by *exclamo* (Mark ix 24, Matt. xv 22) and by *adclamo* (Mark xv 13, 14) as well as by *clamo* (Mark ix 26, x 47, 48, xi 9, Matt. viii 29, ix 27, xv 23); and so far as there are shades of difference between the three alternatives, *exclamare* is here (in Mark xv 39) the most appropriate.

support—all authorities in fact except ℵ B L: in the second place it was in all probability from Mark xv 39 that Matthew derived κράξας in xxvii 50 κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ: in the third place κράζω is not used of our Lord anywhere else in the Synoptic Gospels (though three times in the Fourth Gospel), and it is exactly the sort of indication of violent emotion that Alexandrian critics would have liked to modify. I conclude that it belongs to the genuine text of Mark, and we have to choose between οὕτως ἔκραξεν and οὕτως κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν. I should like to add a further argument, though to some readers it will perhaps seem an over subtle one. What was it that moved the centurion to the particular conclusion that He who had so cried out at the moment of death was 'a son of God'? It is (is it not?) a question that calls imperatively for answer: and I cannot help thinking that St Luke gives the key to the solution. Mark's informant heard the cry, for it was loud, but was too far off to hear what the words of the cry were: Luke tells us that it was 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'. If the centurion had asked of some one near him what the (Hebrew) words meant, and learnt that Jesus died with the confident appeal to God as Father on His lips, then the conclusion that this was in truth 'a son of God' becomes at last intelligible.

27. xv 43 ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. But D *k* have πτῶμα (*cadauer*); just as in xv 45 ℵ B D L 565 have ἐδωρήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ, the rest σῶμα (with *k corpus*). I cannot suppose that Mark meant to distinguish more respectful language of Joseph from more contemptuous language of Pilate: he is too artless a writer for such refinements. He used, I think, in both cases πτῶμα of the Lord's dead body, but we cannot wonder that Matthew and Luke in their parallels to *v.* 43 (both omit in *v.* 45) have substituted σῶμα, or that most MSS of Mark have followed them: D is in fact the only witness that gives πτῶμα in both cases, but I believe it to be right, and would read here ᾐτήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

28. xvi 1 καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ἡ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα . . . The names here are omitted by D *k n*, that is (since *n* is equivalent to *a*) by our three best Western authorities; *a b i* are defective. And omission appears to be right; if the ordinary text had lain before Matthew and Luke, why does neither of them make any mention of Salome in the Resurrection narrative? Moreover the text of Mark becomes more intelligible if we read xv 47, xvi 1 continuously with only one mention of names, ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται· καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου [πορευθεῖσαι[1]] ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἀλείψωσιν

[1] It is true that πορεύομαι is not a Marcan word, though παραπορεύομαι (ii 23, ix 30, xi 20, xv 29) is fairly common. But ἐλθοῦσαι of the critical texts is suspect,

αὐτόν. What then was the genesis of the ordinary text? As so often, it is due to the influence of the text of Matthew: Matthew mentions the women at three points, xxvii 56 repeated from Mark xv 40, xxvii 61 repeated from Mark xv 47, and, *because he has here interpolated the story of the sealing of the tomb*, the names of xxvii 61 are repeated in xxviii 1. Because Matthew had the names three times, Mark must have them three times also, though in Mark there is no interval. And the interpolators, with the fondness of interpolators for fullness, make, as it happens, the insertion not of the two names of Matt. xxviii 1 but of the three of Matt. xxvii 56 = Mark xv 40.

Here then are twenty-eight Western readings from the second half of the Gospel, selected more or less by chance, though it is hoped that a good many of the most important variants between the Alexandrian and the Western texts are included. In something like two-thirds of them I should myself judge the Western variation to represent more or less certainly what the evangelist wrote: in nos. **2**, **3**, **5**, **10**, **20**, **21**, **26**, **28** I should not put it higher than that the Western reading has the better claim of the two: in **16** and **18** the issue is doubtful—the balance may even incline the other way. But if these conclusions are anywhere near the mark, it is abundantly clear that the accepted results of the textual criticism of the Gospels need to be re-opened and re-examined. And, with that aim in view, some further precision both as to the causes which account for the depravation of the Marcan original in the Alexandrian tradition (reproduced in our critical texts), and also as to what seems *prima facie* to be the relative value in the cases before us of the different authorities or groups of authorities on the 'Western' side, will not be out of place.

(1) *Causes of the errors of the Alexandrian tradition in all or most of the readings discussed.*

a. By far the most common cause of error is assimilation to the text of one or both of the other two Synoptists. All authorities or groups of authorities for St Mark's Gospel succumb in varying degrees and on different occasions to this temptation. The Alexandrian text of Mark would seem to shew examples of this, by assimilation to Matthew, in **7**, **8**, **9**, (**10**), **11**, (**12**), **14**, **15**, (**19**), **20**, **21**, **24**, **25**, (**28**); by assimilation to Luke, in **2**, **3**, **6**, **22**[1]; by assimilation to both, in **13**, **17**, **27**; altogether

for often as Mark employs ἔρχομαι, this is the one passage (if we except v 26 εἰς το χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα, 'went from bad to worse', and that is not literal but metaphorical) where we must translate not 'come' but 'go'. In any case the reading πορευθεῖσαι is not necessarily bound up with the omission of the names. Θ 565 have the names and yet have πορευθεῖσαι as well as ἐλθοῦσαι.

[1] And conceivably also **23**: if the ἐσταύρωσαν of all save the Western texts needs

in twenty-one cases out of twenty-eight, just three-fourths of the total number, though in one or two cases there may be alternative or contributory causes.

β. Another *vera causa* of Alexandrian corruption of the text of Mark is the desire to remove the imperfections or non-literary elements of Mark's Greek. This accounts for **1**, **4**, and probably **5**.

γ. A third criterion of variants in the tradition of Mark's text is evidence of Marcan usage. Mark's fondness for tautological expressions suggests that the fuller text is right in **17** and **19**.

These three causes, then, account between them for twenty-four out of the twenty-eight variations discussed above. There remain only **16**, **18**, **23**, **26**. In the first two of these decision is difficult, and the Western reading is perhaps probably wrong. In **23** internal evidence and the parallel in Matthew appear to me to be decisive: in **26** I believe the Alexandrians to be wrong, but there remain two Western readings between which we have to decide.

(ii) *The relative value of different authorities supporting the Western readings.*

α. In more than half the readings discussed there is some evidence from Eastern witnesses—witnesses, that is, which give us the ancient text, as it seems, of Antioch or Caesarea, especially Θ 565 and the Sinai Syriac, less often *fam* 1 *fam* 13 and 28—in support of strictly Western texts: namely in **3**, **4**, **5**, **6**, **7**, **8**, (**11**), **13**, **14**, (**15**), **16**, **17**, **19**, (**20**), **22**, **24**, **26**. But, important as their evidence is, it does not in my judgement amount to being decisive. A reading unsupported by them is not necessarily wrong. The Western and the Alexandrian texts are primary: each of them may be right against all the rest. I doubt if the Eastern texts are ever, I am sure they are not often, right against the Western and Alexandrian texts combined. Their value comes in in cases where the Western texts are divided: in **3**, **17**, **22** I accept readings where D and European Latins (in **22** only D *a*) are supported respectively by Θ *fam* 13 565, by Θ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 565, and by syr-sin, against ℵ B *k*.

β. Better than any other witness apart from ℵ B is *k*. It gives the Western reading in all our twenty-eight cases except **3**, **17**, **22**.[1] It is in my judgement right alone in **21** and perhaps in **26**: probably right with W only in **2**: right with D only in **9**, **27**, with D Iren. in **10**, with D *n* (that is, presumably *a*) in **28**, with D *c i* in **25**: right with *c* only in **1**. But perhaps the most striking result of our enquiry is that even

any other explanation than the mis-directed intelligence of scribes, it may have arisen out of a marginal jotting due to Luke xxiii 33.

[1] In **19** *k* has an omission by *homoeoteleuton* which removes its ultimate evidence from consideration.

the combination ℵ B *k* is not necessarily right: **3**, **17**, **22** seem to shew that the 'African'[1] and Alexandrian texts may, on some rare occasions, agree in error against what one may call provisionally the texts of Rome and Antioch. It is difficult to construct a history of text-development which will account satisfactorily for this phenomenon: but there it is.

γ. Of the other Latins *a* and *i* are definitely the best.

δ. Always the most puzzling problem is the text of D. Not counting the two readings, **16**, **18**, where the whole Western group, D *k* included, is perhaps wrong, it gives all the readings here recommended except **1**, **2**, **17**, **21**, **26**: of these **21** and **26** are singular readings of *k*, and **2** of *k* W, and in **17** *k* is wrong as well as D. No account has, however, been taken of any singular readings of D. And we do not therefore get further than that D, however erratic on occasion, contains a very valuable text.

These results are based on too small a number of instances to be more than provisional. But I think they are important in their implications.

C. H. TURNER.

DID CODEX VERCELLENSIS (*a*) CONTAIN THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF ST MARK?

SOME doubt must naturally hang over the problem of the earliest Western text of the ending of St Mark's Gospel: for three of our authorities, *b e* and *i*, are defective at that point, and the rest are divided, *k* having the Shorter Ending only, while D and *ff* contain enough of the Longer Ending to shew that when complete they contained the whole of it. And since Irenaeus also bears witness to the Longer Ending, it may be concluded that the Church of Gaul at any rate had it in its Gospel text from the first. Thus Gaul and Africa are set against one another: but we have so far no evidence as to Italy. The object of the present note is to examine the evidence of the oldest and best of our Italian Old Latin MSS, codex *a*, the Vercelli Gospels.

Now the St Gall fragments known as *n* are admitted to stand in very close relation textually to *a*: and they contain verses 9 to 13 of Mark xvi on the last leaf extant (*Old Latin Biblical Texts* ii p. 72). There was therefore some presumption to start with that *a* also once contained the Longer Ending.

[1] I have myself always supposed that the 'African' text came from Rome. I only call it 'African' because St Cyprian's evidence shews that it was the text of Carthage in A. D. 250.